

New Series

Volume XI, Number 41

February 1960

The Review of English Studies

THE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN
APR 19 1960

PERIODICAL
READING ROOM

*A Quarterly Journal of
English Literature and the English Language*

Editors: PETER ALEXANDER, NORMAN DAVIS

CONTENTS

- Palaces of Pleasure: The Theme of Revenge in Elizabethan
Translations of Novelle. By Ernst de Chickera . . . 1
- 'Strength's Abundance': A View of *Othello*. By J. K. Walton . . . 8
- Heywood's *Ages* and Shakespeare. By Ernest Schanzer . . . 18
- An Image of Disenchantment in the Novels of George Eliot.
By D. R. Carroll . . . 29
- The Publication of *The Time Machine* 1894-5. By Bernard
Bergonzi . . . 42

NOTES

- Old Kentish *Wig* and Middle English *Otwy* (C. J. E. Ball) . . . 52
- A Printed Source for 'the Devonshire Manuscript' (Richard C.
Harrier) . . . 54
- Tityre-tu* and the Date of William Rowley's *Woman Never
Vext* (I. A. Shapiro) . . . 55
- Comus*, once more, 1761 (Ann Gossman and George W. Whiting) . . . 56

(Continued at foot of next page)

OXFORD · AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

Single number: 14/- net: Subscription for four consecutive numbers: 45/-

The Review of English Studies

Advisory Panel: H. S. BENNETT; JOHN BUTT; R. W. CHAPMAN; H. B. CHARLTON; SIR IFOR EVANS; SIR HERBERT GRIERSON; EDITH J. MORLEY; ALLARDYCE NICOLL; PERCY SIMPSON; KENNETH SISAM; D. NICHOL SMITH; JAMES R. SUTHERLAND; ALICE WALKER; DOROTHY WHITELOCK; F. P. WILSON; J. DOVER WILSON; C. L. WRENN.

MSS. offered for publication, correspondence on the subject-matter of the Journal, and books for review should be addressed to The Editors, *The Review of English Studies*, c/o The Clarendon Press, Oxford. MSS. cannot be returned unless postage is enclosed. Authors of articles printed will be entitled to 25 free offprints and may buy additional copies if application is made to the Editor when returning corrected proofs.

All other correspondence should be addressed to the Publishers, Oxford University Press, Amen House, Warwick Square, London, E.C. 4.

CONTENTS (continued)

REVIEWS, ETC.

Cynewulf's *Elene*, edited by P. O. E. Gradon, 61; The Peterborough Chronicle 1070-1154, edited by Cecily Clark, 63; Medieval English Poetry. The Non-Chaucerian Tradition, by John Speirs, 65; *Piers Plowman* and the Scheme of Salvation, by Robert Worth Frank, Jr., 67; The Wakefield Pageants in the Towneley Cycle, edited by A. C. Cawley, 69; William Dunbar. Poems, edited by James Kinsley, 71; The Paul's Cross Sermons 1534-1642, by Millar MacLure, 73; Shakespeare from *Richard II* to *Henry V*, by Derek Traversi, 75; *Othello*, edited by M. R. Ridley, 77; The London Shakespeare, edited by John Munro, 78; Shakespeare Survey 11, edited by Allardyce Nicoll, 81; *The Changeling* by Thomas Middleton and William Rowley, edited by N. W. Bawcutt, 82; The Poetical Works of John Milton, revised edition by Helen Darbishire, 84; Homer und die englische Humanität. Chapmans und Popes Übersetzungskunst im Rahmen der humanistischen Tradition, by Rudolf Sühnel, 85; Pope and Human Nature, by Geoffrey Tillotson, 87; *A Tale of a Tub*, To which is added *The Battle of the Books* and the *Mechanical Operation of the Spirit* by Jonathan Swift, edited by A. C. Guthkelch and D. Nichol Smith, 89; The Personality of Jonathan Swift, by Irvin Ehrenpreis, 92; James Thomson (1700-1748): Letters and Documents, edited by Alan Dugald McKillop, 93; Doctor Johnson and Others, by S. C. Roberts, 96; The History of Fanny Burney, by Joyce Hemlow, 97; Englische Vorromantik und deutscher Sturm und Drang. M. G. Lewis' Stellung in der Geschichte der deutsch-englischen Literaturbeziehungen, by Karl S. Guthke, 100; The Early Wordsworthian Milieu. A Notebook of Christopher Wordsworth with a few Entries by William Wordsworth, edited by Z. S. Fink, 102; The English Romantic Poets and Essayists, by Northrop Frye and others, 104; The Romantic Assertion, by R. A. Foakes, 105; Thackeray: The Age of Wisdom. 1847-1863, by Gordon N. Ray, 107; Letters of the Brownings to George Barrett, edited by Paul Landis and Ronald E. Freeman, 109; Ten Studies in the Poetry of Matthew Arnold, by Paull F. Baum, 112; Prolegomena to the Study of Yeats's Poems, by George Brandon Saul, 113; The American Novel and its Tradition, by Richard Chase, and The Power of Blackness. Hawthorne, Poe, Melville, by Harry Levin, 114; Short Notices, 118; Summary of Periodical Literature, 122; List of Publications Received, 126.

PALACES OF PLEASURE: THE THEME OF REVENGE IN ELIZABETHAN TRANSLATIONS OF NOVELLE

By ERNST DE CHICKERA

BETWEEN the years 1566 and 1576 four large collections of short 'novels', mainly translations of Italian *novelle*, were offered to the Elizabethan reader: William Painter's *The Palace of Pleasure* (1566 and 1567),¹ Geoffrey Fenton's *Certain Tragical Discourse of Bandello* (1567), and George Pettie's *A Petite Palace of Pettie his Pleasure* (1576). Though Pettie's tales are not *novelle* in the strict sense of the term, there is Elizabethan precedent for grouping them with Painter's work and Fenton's. J. Stockwood in a sermon preached at Paul's Cross on 24 August 1578² made no distinction but inveighed equally against 'the great Pallace and little Pallace of pleasure, with a number moe of suche filthy bookes'. To an Elizabethan Puritan such differences as we tend to see between Pettie and his predecessors did not exist: all these tales of love and crime, whether of Rhomeo and Julietta, of the unfortunate marriage of Antonio Bologna with the Duchess of Malfi, or of Tereus and Progne, are worldly vanities, the more dangerous because dressed up with all the allurements of the psychology and rhetoric in fashion at the time.

To the popularity of these tales there is the testimony of many hostile witnesses. Ascham referred to the 'precepts of fonde bookes, of late translated out of Italian into English, sold in every shop in London'.³ Gosson, a playwright who had turned divine, declared that the Palace of Pleasure had been 'thoroughly ransackt to furnish the Playehouses in London'.⁴ And Lodge, who had defended the stage against the attacks of Gosson, yet regarded the seeking of 'nouvelles from afar'⁵ as one of the symptoms of the contemporary decline in morals and manners. These volumes of novels not merely furnished the Elizabethan dramatist with his plots but, 'finding their way into every house, helped to prepare an audience for the dramatists'.⁶

¹ Volume 1 was printed in 1566, and reprinted in 1569 with five additional stories. Volume 2 was printed in 1567. In 1575 Volumes 1 and 2 were reprinted together. Quotations from Painter are taken from J. Jacobs's edition (1890); for Fenton's translation I use R. L. Douglas's edition (1898), and for Pettie's work I use I. Gollancz's edition (1908).

² J. Stockwood, *A Sermon preached at St. Paul's Cross* (1578), p. 147.

³ R. Ascham, *English Works*, ed. W. Wright (Cambridge, 1904), p. 229.

⁴ S. Gosson, *Plays Confuted in Five Actions* (1582), sig. D5^v.

⁵ T. Lodge, *Works*, ed. E. Gosse (1883), i. 86.

⁶ R. L. Douglas (ed.), Fenton, i.x.

The aim of this article is to sort out the ideas and attitudes to Revenge in these stories so as to see their relationship to the basic ideas and attitudes in the Elizabethan Tragedy of Revenge.

The subject-matter of these stories is well described by Painter in words which apply equally well to those of Fenton and Pettie:

... in these Histories, (which by another terme I call Nouelles) be described the liues, gestes, conquestes, and highe enterprises of great Princes, wherein also be not forgotten the cruell actes and tyranny of some. In these be set forth the great valiance of noble Gentlemen, the terrible combates of couragious personages, the vertuous mindes of noble Dames, the chaste hartes of constant Ladyes, the wonderful patience of puissaunt Princes, the mild sufferance of well disposed gentlewomen, and in diuers, the quiet bearing of aduers Fortune. In these Histories be depainted in liuelye colours, the vglye shapes of insolencye and pride, the deforme figures of incontinenie and rape, the cruell aspectes of spoyle, breach of order, treason, ill-lucke, and overthrow of States and other persons. (i. 5)

But the many stories of private revenge which are to be found among these 'histories' of passion can be divided into these two types, with the help of a distinction which is made in one of Painter's revenge stories. In this story, of Mistress Helena of Florence, a widow makes her lover stand out a whole night in the snow, in revenge for which he tricks her into standing naked on a tower on a hot July day. In reply to the woman's pleas that he should call off the punishment since she has already suffered enough, the scholar says,

But yet as I am no Eagle, and thou no Doue, but a most venomous Serpent, I intend so well as I can to persecute thee mine auncient enemy, wyth the greatest mallice I can deuise, which I cannot so properly cal reuenge, as I may term it Correction: for that the reuenge of a matter ought to surmount the Offence, and I will bestow no reuenge on thee; for if I were disposed to apply my mynde therevnto, for respect of thy displeasure done to me, thy Lyfe should not suffice, nor one hundred more like vnto thine. (iii. 343)

With the help of this distinction between Revenge and Correction we can divide these stories of revenge into two types. The first is that in which the wrong or injury comes back to the wrongdoer in almost equal measure, the sort of revenge which the character just referred to would prefer to term correction. Measure is given for measure. The wrong is not righted but is balanced by the revenger, and he can cry quits. Painter's story of the President of Grenoble who 'advertised of the ill gouvernement of his wife, took such order that his honestie was not diminished, and yet revenged the fact' is well worth examining in detail because it best elucidates this type of Revenge Story. When the President discovers the intrigue between his wife and his clerk,

he forbad them to shewe no likelyhode of any such matter, and commaunded his wyfe to attire and dresse her selfe in more gorgeous apparell, than she was wont to weare, and to haunt and resort to company and feastes, willing the Clarke to make a better countenance on the matter than he did before.

(ii. 102-3)

But the President made one stipulation: that as soon as he commanded the Clerk to leave the town, he should do so within four hours. At last, after a respite of fifteen days the Clerk heard the order and obeyed. And the President, after he had shown more tokens of his love for his wife,

vppon a fair day in the moneth of May, he went to gather a sallade in his garden, the herbes whereof after she had eaten, she lived not above xxiii houres after, whereof he counterfainted suche sorrowe, as no man could suspect the occasion of her death. And by that meanes he was revenged of his enemy, and saved the honour of his house. (ii. 103)

The President balances the wrong done him with a tact and discretion which seem almost to take the edge off his act of revenge. But the extent to which Painter seems interested in the revenge aspect of the story he translates can only be seen by placing side by side his concluding remarks and those of his original. Painter's version reads thus:

'I will not by this Nouell (said Emarsuite) prayse the conscience of the President, but herein I have declared the light behauiour of a woman, and the great pacience and prudence of a man: Praying you good ladies all, not to be offended at the truthe.' 'If all women (quo Parlamente) that loue their Clarkes or seruauntes, were forced to eate such sallades, I beleue they woulde not loue their gardens so well as they doe, but would teare and plucke vp all the herbes bothe roote and rinde, to auoyde those things that by death might aduaunce the honor of their stock and lineage.' 'If sallades be so costly (quod Hircan) and so daungerous in May, I will provoke appetite with other sawces, or els hunger shall be my chieftest.' (ii. 103)

Painter's original discusses the story from a different angle:

'I think that the husband, since he wished to be avenged, acted extremely prudently and wisely.' 'But also very maliciously', Longarine said, 'for it was long and cruel vengeance, which showed that he had neither God nor conscience before his eyes.' 'What would you have had him do', Hircan asked her, 'to punish her for the greatest wrong that a woman can do a man?' 'He ought not to have killed her, unless he did so in the first moment of his rage,' she said, 'for she might have lived with him like a virtuous wife and the whole matter had passed over.' 'You do not suppose', Saffredant remarked, 'that he was appeased, though he pretended to be so, and I am sure he was just as much in a rage on the last day when he made the salad as he was on the first day when he first found out her shame: for there are some persons whose first emotions

have no interval till they act as their passion dictates, and I quite agree with the theologians who say that such sins find pardon very easily.¹

What is here a matter of serious interest in the ethics of a particular type of revenge psychology becomes in Painter the occasion for much facetiousness on the subject of salads. Pettie's story of Sinorix and Camma with its balanced sentences conveys an almost visual impression of this type of revenge, the wrong which balances wrong:

Therefore, Gentlewomen, I leave it to your judgments to give sentence, whether be more worthy reprehension, he or she. He had the law of love on his side, she had the law of men and of marriage on her part; love led him, which the gods themselves cannot resist, chastity guided her, which the gods themselves have lost; he killed him whom he counted his enemy, she killed him who she knew her fleshly friend; she with reason might have prevented great mischief; his wings were too much lined with lust to fly forth of his folly.

(i. 48)

The whole affair is so neatly tied together, has such a symmetry, that any judgement on the act of revenge alone seems a breach of faith with the balance which has been achieved at the end of the story.

The second type of revenge story is that in which the wrongdoer is punished with a severity out of all proportion to the offence, so that it can be said of such that the revenge 'surmounts the offence'. A story true to type is one told by Painter of the revenge exacted by a Captain on the Lords of Nocera for adultery committed between one of them and his wife, and of the counter revenge by one of the younger brothers of these Lords on the Captain for his act. When the Captain discovers his wife's infidelity, he does not take revenge immediately, a delay which evokes this comment from the author:

And truely it had ben more tollerable and lesse hurteful for the Lieuテナunte, if euen then hee had perpetrated his vengeaunce, and punyshed them for theyr wyckednesse, than to vse the Cruelty wherewith afterwarde he blotted his renoume, and soyled his hands by Bedlem rage in the innocent bloud of those that were not priuie to the folly and lesse guilty of the wronge don vnto him.

(iii. 371)

The Captain delayed his vengeance 'to trap in one toyle and snare' not only the guilty lord but his two brothers as well, even though they were innocent of the crime, for 'the revenge of the cruel man extended further'. The reader is next treated to a most vivid description of the butchery carried out by the Captain assisted by the soldiers of the fort. The first victim is the guilty 'overlord' and the manner of his death leads the author to remark,

Ire beyng wythout measure, and anger wythout Brydle or reason, it is not to be wondred, if in al his actes the Captayne ouerpassed the just measure of

¹ Margaret of Navarre, *Heptameron*, tr. W. M. Thomson (1896), p. 220.

vengeance. Many would thinke the committed murder vppon Nicholas, to be good and iust; but the Iustice of an offense, ought not so longe time to be conceyled, but rather to make him feele the smart at the very tyme the deed is done, to the ende that the nypping gryefe of pestilent treason wrought against the betrayed party, be not obscured and hydden by sodayne rage and lacke of reason rising in the mindes first motions, and thereby also the faulte of the guilty by hys indiscretion couered: otherwyse there is nothyng that can colour sutch vice. (iii. 379-80)

But one of the brothers of the overlord had not walked into the trap and he returns to take vengeance on the Captain and his followers with consummate brutality. Of this give and take of horror and cruelty on both sides the author says:

The one ought to content hymselfe (as I haue sayd) for being reuenged on him that had offended him, and the other of the murder done, during the assault without shewing so bloudy tokens of cruelty and so apparent euidence of tyranny, vpon the ministers of the brutall and bloudy Captayne. (iii. 392)

The author accepts the necessity of wrong balancing wrong but insists that 'Temperance, and Modesty is necessary in al occurentes, bee they wyth vs, or against vs'. (iii. 364)

If we compare this with the original version in *Bandello* we see a significant difference. In his *Dedicatory Preface* *Bandello* draws its moral clearly enough:

By this story you will see what evils come from not knowing how to govern oneself and not choosing whiles to put a bridle on the turbulent, fiery and headstrong passion of anger, whenas it assaileth us.

He then proceeds to the explicit condemnation of private vengeance:

I deny not that vengeance unto proud souls is a sweet thing and a very great satisfaction, whenas it is regularly and moderately wroughten; but, for my part, I would never choose to put out one of mine eyes for the putting out of two of mine enemy's: the generous spirit of Julius Caesar, perpetual dictator and first begetter of the Roman Empire, who never forgot aught but injuries and was ever ready to forgive them, being far more to my liking. If, indeed, by avenging the death of a brother, a son or a friend, the dead might be restored to life or if thereby an injury done might be undone, I would say that a man should without any scruple or hesitation avenge himself; but, there ensuing none of these things, meseemeth that, ere he go about to add evil to evil, he should thoroughly consider the possible issue thereof, more by token that we, being Christians and fain to be worthy of so glorious a name, should e'en be imitators of Christ, who commandeth us to forgive our enemies.¹

This quotation is necessary, first, because there is nothing like it in *Painter* and, secondly, because it contradicts the received opinion that the only

¹ M. *Bandello*, *The Novels*, tr. J. Payne (1890), iii. 17.

attitude to revenge in the Italian *novelle* is frank acceptance of it. That Painter gives it a different emphasis altogether is evident in his opening sentence:

The furious rage of a Husband offended for the chastity violated in his Wyfe, surpasseth all other, and ingendreth mallice agaynst the doer whatsoever he be. (iii. 363)

With him the accent is on the consequences arising from adulterous passion; with Bandello the stress is on the dangers of unrestrained anger. Bandello's rejection of revenge, so general in its application, is narrowed in Painter to a particular instance:

Learne here also (o yee husbands) not to fly with so nimble Wing, as by your owne authority yee seeke reveng without fearing the follies and sclaunders that may insue. Your sorrow is just, but it behoueth that reason doe guide your fantasies, and bridle your over sodayne passions, to the intent that yee come not after to sing the doleful Song of repentaunce. (iii. 393-4)

This forms part of an epilogue on the dangers of unchastity in the married state and has no warrant in Bandello. The reason for this radical change in Painter is the simple one that he was using as his text Belleforest's French translation of Bandello in which the changes had already appeared.

The leading ideas lying scattered amidst these narrative passages may be summarized as follows. Revenge is the recoil of the spring, for all acts must return to the wrongdoer. He who sows the wind must reap the whirlwind. But in the inevitability of revenge the necessity for moderation must never be lost sight of. Let us not like these ill-starred characters 'the mean meanly account of'. Let Reason be our guide. Camma 'with reason might have prevented great mischief';¹ so might all the other unfortunate characters if only they had heeded that guide.

In contrast to these stories of private revenge are a few which recognize that the punishment of wrong is a matter for the State. Fenton has one in his collection. The father of the dead woman is only prevented from taking private revenge on the murderers by his trust in the office of the Magistrate—a sentiment so rare in these stories as to deserve special notice:

Neither had thies handes refrained so longe the dismembriage of his cursed partes, yf the vertue in your othe and office hadde not beene my warrante to have justice by you. (ii. 123)

With the recognition of public revenge comes inevitably the idea of divine vengeance,

And heare you may see the commoditie that commonly attendes the villanie of suche as unjustlye spill the blood of their neighbour, seinge that God hath

¹ Pettie, i. 48.

willed by his divine providence that tooth for toothe, and eye for eye, be taken from hym, who (wythout the consent of the lawe) offendeth his brother. (ii. 128)

Sublimation of the desire for revenge in the contemplation of 'true virtue' or magnanimity is another of the alternatives offered to private revenge. Fenton provides a sample of the type which might be termed revenge recollected in tranquillity. In this story when the gentleman of Syenna first hears of the plight of his rival he is glad to see him facing the prospect of death. But later in a more sober mood he reflects thus:

shal the offer of any unseamely reveng prevaile above that respect and duty thou art borne to beare and owe unto true vertue. (i. 40)

And so without more ado he decides to bury 'the desyer of vengeaunce in a tombe of eternall oblivion'.

But what we do not find anywhere in these collections is that story in which revenge as a binding duty made sacred by the disability of the injured himself to repay is seen in conflict with a society, that, for whatever reason, deprives the injured of justice. For this, surely, is the essence of the tragic conflict in *Revenge Tragedy*. For only from such a conflict can arise the protagonist of *Revenge Tragedy*: the Revenger, with his doubts, his hesitations, his search for proofs, and his madness. The *novelle*, then, can be seen to reveal one attitude to Revenge, and *Revenge Tragedy* another.

Since private revenge is always conceived as the inevitable balancing of wrong, the state of mind possible for the revenger is generally that of a steadfast resolution to revenge such as Camma shows:

And until such time as I have opportunity hereto, I will prolong my doleful days in direful grief, and only the hope of revengement shall heavily hold my loathsome life and sorrowful soul together.¹

Finally, to sum up the leading ideas of revenge in these collections: it is a basic impulse, natural and spontaneous. It is a reaction no more separable from its originating action than effect from cause. So long as equity in revenge is observed, all is well. But that revenge which is out of all proportion to the offence, which disturbs the equity of punishment, must be shunned. Such revenge becomes a possibility only when reason is surrendered to passion, and to surrender reason is to forfeit the one possession which distinguishes men from beasts.

¹ Pettie, i. 43.

'STRENGTH'S ABUNDANCE': A VIEW OF *OTHELLO*

By J. K. WALTON

IN the criticism of *Othello* two main trends may be discerned among the multitude of interpretations. One is the view that Othello meets his doom on account of some weakness in himself; the other that he is not doomed through any fault of his own. The former was first expounded by Thomas Rymer, who saw him as a 'Jealous Booby',¹ 'a tedious, drawing, tame Goose . . . gaping after any paultrey insinuation, labouring to be jealous'.² The opposing view was adumbrated by Dr. Johnson³ and first stated by Coleridge. Coleridge insisted that 'Othello does not kill Desdemona in jealousy, but in a conviction forced upon him by the almost superhuman art of Iago, such a conviction as any man would and must have entertained who had believed Iago's honesty as Othello did'.⁴ This view was held in varying forms by the leading critics of the nineteenth century and given its fullest exposition by Bradley. There were, however, nineteenth-century critics, chiefly German and American, who followed in the Rymer tradition;⁵ and it has many twentieth-century adherents. T. S. Eliot thinks that Othello's last great speech contains the most 'terrible exposure of human weakness' which he has ever read; for him it is a piece of self-dramatization and self-deception arising from a failure to achieve humility.⁶ The authors of the two most recent books on the play, G. R. Elliott⁷ and R. B. Heilman,⁸ both emphasize what they see as Othello's weaknesses. Many of the arguments of critics of the Rymer school have, however, been answered by Miss Helen Gardner,⁹ J. Dover

¹ *The Critical Works of Thomas Rymer*, ed. Curt A. Zimansky (New Haven, 1956), p. 154.

² *Ibid.*, p. 149. Rymer, like some of those who blame Othello, tends to think that Desdemona is also guilty. Her marriage is 'unnatural' (p. 150), and 'such impatience, such a rout for a handsome young fellow, the very morning after her Marriage must make him either to be jealous, or to take her for a *Changeling*, below his Jealousie' (p. 149).

³ See *Johnson on Shakespeare*, ed. Walter Raleigh (Oxford, 1908), pp. 200-1.

⁴ This is H. N. Coleridge's expansion of Coleridge's note: see *Coleridge's Shakespearean Criticism*, ed. T. M. Raysor (London, 1930), i. 125.

⁵ See, for example, the views of D. J. Snider and F. Bodenstedt quoted in the *Furness Variorum*, vol. vi (Philadelphia, 1886), 425-8 and 440-1 respectively.

⁶ See *Selected Essays* (London, 2nd edn. 1934), pp. 130-1. The passage occurs in 'Shakespeare and the Stoicism of Seneca'.

⁷ *Flaming Minister: a Study of Othello as Tragedy of Love and Hate* (Durham, N.C., 1953).

⁸ *Magic in the Web: Action and Language in Othello* (Lexington, 1956).

⁹ 'The Noble Moor', *Proc. Brit. Acad.*, xli (1955), 189-205.

Wilson,¹ and M. R. Ridley,² all of whom follow the Coleridge-Bradley view of Othello as 'the noble Moor'; but there remains one serious criticism of the Coleridge-Bradley position which has not, I think, been fully met. According to Bradley, 'the action and catastrophe of *Othello* depend largely on intrigue', and the intrigue is 'Iago's character in action'.³ F. R. Leavis argues that this interpretation is unbalanced: it gives Othello a passive role and sees the tragedy produced by a force external to himself.⁴ For Leavis, Iago is 'merely ancillary', and 'not much more than a necessary piece of dramatic mechanism'.⁵ Othello falls through his own weakness, a tendency to self-dramatization and sentimentality which makes him easily jealous. An obvious difficulty about this view is that it is 'reductive', to use Heilman's word for Iago's way of thinking;⁶ it tends to make the tragedy untragic. Leavis, in fact, travelling by a path different from Bradley's, arrives like him at the conclusion that *Othello* 'comes below Shakespeare's supreme—his very greatest—works'.⁷ I wish to suggest an interpretation which is not 'reductive' and which, while not considering Iago to be merely a dramatic mechanism, sees the action of the tragedy as deriving in large part from Othello and Desdemona.

Iago, whether seen as dramatic mechanism or consummate villain, has often been taken to be an essentially isolated figure. This is surely a mistake. He is rather an extreme embodiment of a number of attitudes which other of the Venetians are shown, directly or by implication, as possessing. When he first appears he is presented as a Venetian who is complaining that he has been passed by in favour of an outsider, a Florentine, despite the fact that

Three great ones of the city,
In personal suit to make me his lieutenant,
Off-capp'd to him (I. i. 8-10)⁸

—to 'his Moorship'. Like Roderigo, a representative of 'the wealthy curled darlings of our nation',⁹ he 'loves' Desdemona and resents Othello's possession of her. Roderigo's exclamation as he resolves to kill Cassio—'Tis but a man gone' (v. i. 10)—is of a piece with Iago's customary

¹ Introduction to *Othello*, ed. Alice Walker and J. Dover Wilson (Cambridge, 1957).

² Introduction to the Arden *Othello* (London, 1958).

³ *Shakespearean Tragedy* (London, 2nd edn. 1905), p. 179.

⁴ See 'Diabolic Intellect and the Noble Hero: or The Sentimentalist's Othello' in *The Common Pursuit* (London, 1952), pp. 136-59.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 138.

⁶ *Magic in the Web*, p. 195 and elsewhere.

⁷ *The Common Pursuit*, p. 155. For Bradley's view see *Shakespearean Tragedy*, pp. 185-6.

⁸ Quotations are from *William Shakespeare: the Complete Works*, ed. Peter Alexander (London and Glasgow, 1951).

⁹ These words are spoken of course by Brabantio (I. ii. 68).

cynicism. Like Brabantio, Iago considers the marriage of Othello and Desdemona unnatural, and, like him, he tends to see people as property. He awakens Brabantio with the cry of 'Thieves' to tell him that he is 'robb'd', a cry which Brabantio takes up—'Down with him, thief' (i. ii. 57), 'O thou foul thief' (i. 62), 'She is . . . stol'n from me' (i. iii. 60). The Duke, despite his restraint due to the State's need of Othello, speaks of the marriage in the same terms:

The robb'd that smiles steals something from the thief;
He robs himself that spends a bootless grief. (i. iii. 208-9)

Here again it is Iago who gives the most extreme expression to this attitude. He knows his 'price', and makes Roderigo his purse.

Of Iago's various motives, there are only two which none of the other characters possesses: his jealousy—unless we take Roderigo to be jealous—and his desire for revenge. But, so far as Shakespeare's audience was concerned, there would have been no need to introduce characters with these motives in order to show Iago as an extreme expression of his environment, since these were motives which such an audience was accustomed to have associated with Italians in general.¹ Iago's use of sea imagery² may also have suggested to Shakespeare's audience a connexion with Venice not apparent to an audience of today; for in the early seventeenth century Venice, though in decline, was still a sea-power, and still noted for its association with the sea.³

It is in relation to Iago's representative role that we should consider his motivation. The sinister ambiguity of his motives arises precisely because he is so representative a figure. If Shakespeare had given Iago only one motive, or had emphasized one more than another, he would have been less representative and less sinister. The concentration of them all in one person produces an effect greater than that of a simple addition; the whole is greater than the parts, and gives Iago the single effect of malignancy which makes him appear 'more fell than anguish, hunger, or the sea' (v. ii. 365). It is when we see Iago in this way that we can best appreciate the adversary with whom, unknown to themselves, Othello

¹ For a sketch of contemporary English opinion about Italy see Fredson T. Bowers, *Elizabethan Revenge Tragedy, 1587-1642* (Princeton, 1940), pp. 47-57. 'The Italian was almost always regarded as a villain of a particularly jealous and revengeful nature' (p. 47).

² See Caroline F. E. Spurgeon, *Shakespeare's Imagery* (Cambridge, 1935), p. 337: 'Iago, as the soldier of a city which owed its dominance to sea-power, uses sea imagery easily'. W. H. Clemen (*The Development of Shakespeare's Imagery* (London, 1951), p. 126) observes: 'Iago employs technical maritime terms, and colours some of his images with sailor's jargon. . . . He looks at the sea only from a professional point of view.'

³ See, for example, the dedicatory poems by J. Ashley (sig. *3^v) and John Harington (sig. A4^r) in Cardinal Gaspar Contareno, *The Commonwealth and Government of Venice*, tr. Lewes Lewkenor, Esq. (London, 1599).

and Desdemona are faced when they reach Cyprus. Their marriage has been made possible only by a crisis in the Venetian State brought about by the threatened Turkish invasion. This threat vanishes, and the situation which would have made their marriage impossible reappears, together with Iago in whom is found in deadly concentration all the various hostile forces presented in the first Act.

But Iago, for all his force, is not the prime mover of the tragedy. This is to be found in the strength, rather than the weakness, of Othello and Desdemona.¹ Iago's role is limited to that of manipulating the situation so that their strength destroys them. Without that strength his plot would be powerless to bring about their destruction. Iago himself is essentially negative; even in his manipulation of the situation he is merely reacting to the initial action, which is their marriage.

That the tragedy is due to the strength of Othello and Desdemona is brought out in a rich variety of ways throughout the play. The nature of the earlier part of his plot is quite clearly stated by Iago himself. In the soliloquy in which he discusses the scheme whereby he will encourage Cassio to plead with Desdemona to have him reinstated, he observes that

by how much she strives to do him good
She shall undo her credit with the Moor.
So will I turn her virtue into pitch;
And out of her own goodness make the net
That shall enmesh them all. (II. iii. 347-51)

But Desdemona's earlier virtue is also turned by Iago to work her undoing. In III. iii, after he has by means of his insinuations prepared for the direct assault, he proceeds to make definite imputations against her which are based on a cynical interpretation of just those aspects of her conduct in which her greatest courage has consisted. First of all, echoing Brabantio, he suggests that her love for Othello and her resolution to marry him—her 'downright violence and storm of fortunes' (I. iii. 249)—were simply a matter of deceit:

She did deceive her father, marrying you;
And when she seem'd to shake and fear your looks,
She lov'd them most. (III. iii. 210-12)

Iago's second imputation consists of a cynical distortion of the fact that

¹ Edward Dowden (*Shakspeare: a Critical Study of his Mind and Art* (London, 10th edn. 1892), p. 230) cites two lines from Sonnet XXIII,

... some fierce thing replete with too much rage,
Whose strength's abundance weakens his own heart

and remarks: 'Such a fierce thing, made weak by his very strength, is Othello.' See also pp. 242-3: 'The noble nature is taken in the toils because it is noble.'

Desdemona had the strength of character to marry someone of different country, colour, and rank:

Not to affect many proposed matches
Of her own clime, complexion, and degree,
Whereto we see in all things nature tends—
Foh! one may smell in such a will most rank,
Foul disproportion, thoughts unnatural. (III. iii. 233-7)

Later we can see how, quite apart from her generous appeals on Cassio's behalf, her generosity and modesty contribute to her downfall. She dismisses Othello's ill-humour with the thought that

Men's natures wrangle with inferior things,
Though great ones are their object. (III. iv. 145-6)

Even after she has been struck and reviled, she does not think of asking for the protection of her fellow-countrymen, the Venetian messengers. To Emilia's 'I would you had never seen him' she replies,

So would not I: my love doth so approve him
That even his stubbornness, his checks, his frowns—
Prithee unpin me—have grace and favour in them.
(IV. iii. 18-20)

When shortly before her death, Othello tells her, 'Think on thy sins', and she replies 'They are loves I bear to you', she indicates an aspect of the truth that her destruction comes from her strength. Later, when Emilia asks 'O, who hath done this deed?', and she declares, 'Nobody. I myself', she is valiantly trying to shield Othello; but she is also illuminating the inner recesses of her tragic destiny.

So too with Othello there are abundant indications that he owes his downfall to his virtues rather than to weakness. Iago tells us that

The Moor is of a free and open nature
That thinks men honest that but seem to be so;
And will as tenderly be led by th' nose
As asses are. (I. iii. 393-6)

That is, he can be duped because he is 'of a free and open nature'. Iago is a grudging witness to Othello's virtues; and according to ordinary reason and also the stage conventions of the time, when he describes Othello as having a nature of this kind—a nature the opposite of that of the self-regarding, self-dramatizing Othello of some recent critics—we should accept that description as correct. The same point concerning Othello's strength is twice made in the 'temptation' scene itself, at dramatically important points. Just before Iago begins to make specific insinuations

against Desdemona, based on the supposed behaviour of Venetian women and her treatment of her father, he tells Othello to 'observe her well with Cassio', for 'I would not have your free and noble nature|Out of self-bounty be abus'd' (III. iii. 203-4). If we take it that Othello is not, at this very point, being abused out of the 'self-bounty' of a 'free and noble nature', we here impoverish for ourselves the dramatic texture of the play by failing to see the irony. Later, when the success of Iago's plot is hanging by a thread and he faces Othello's 'wak'd wrath', he exclaims as if to himself,

O wretched fool,
That liv'st to make thine honesty a vice!
O monstrous world! Take note, take note, O world,
To be direct and honest is not safe. (III. iii. 379-82)

Here, too, that interpretation is 'reductive' which holds that the danger to Othello arises otherwise than because he is 'direct and honest' and has lived to make his 'honesty a vice'.

When we examine the decisive moments of Othello's deception by Iago, we can see the large part played by his modesty in his fall, so that it would be truer to say that he falls through modesty than through pride.¹ Those critics who speak of Othello's loss of faith in Desdemona tend to make a mechanical division between his faith in her and his faith in himself, whereas they are interrelated. In the conditions presented in the play—where at the time of their marriage they are virtual strangers to each other, and he a stranger to Venice—the one is necessarily based on the other. The only proof of her love that he can have consists in the fact of her devotion to him, and that must ultimately depend on his view of his own merits. When Iago succeeds in destroying Othello's faith in himself, he inevitably succeeds in destroying his faith in her as well. The first part of the 'temptation' scene (III. iii. 35-168) consists essentially of an assault on his self-confidence. Iago, by means of his insinuations, conveys to Othello that he knows more about Cassio, and by implication Desdemona, than he says—and also that he knows more than Othello knows. It is not until l. 169—'O, beware, my lord, of jealousy'—that he begins to develop a direct attack on Desdemona. From Othello's long speech beginning 'Why, why is this?|Think'st thou I'd make a life of jealousy' it is clear that, despite Iago's many insinuations, he still has faith in her:

'Tis not to make me jealous
To say my wife is fair, feeds well, loves company,
Is free of speech, sings, plays, and dances well;
Where virtue is, these are more virtuous. (III. iii. 187-90)

¹ G. R. Elliott, in *Flaming Minister*, suggests that Othello falls through pride.

But in the very next lines in the same speech, he reveals the point which Iago will be able to work on with devastating effect. All that has gone before leads up to this moment when Othello has been manoeuvred into a position where he finds it necessary to state the grounds of his confidence in Desdemona:

Nor from mine own weak merits will I draw
The smallest fear or doubt of her revolt;
For she had eyes, and chose me.

This is modesty, and modesty is strength; but this very strength gives Iago the opportunity of seizing on that aspect of the situation which, in the circumstances of the play, can make that strength become weakness. Othello, besides being modest, is a stranger, and the combination is fatal, for his being a stranger means that he has now no source of assurance of Desdemona's love but the fact that she chose him; and his modesty prevents him from assuming that this must have been for his merits.¹ The way for Iago's advance is now open. He first of all emphasizes Othello's ignorance of Venice, telling him in the following speech, 'Look to your wife; observe her well with Cassio', for

I would not have your free and noble nature
Out of self-bounty be abus'd; look to't.
I know our country disposition well:
In Venice they do let God see the pranks
They dare not show their husbands; their best conscience
Is not to leave 't undone, but keep 't unknown. (III. iii. 203-8)

When Othello admits his ignorance of Venice with 'Dost thou say so?', Iago reinforces the point, with special reference to Desdemona, by echoing Brabantio's words in the first Act, 'She has deceiv'd her father, and may thee' (I. iii. 293). Iago pursues his advantage by making further insinuations; and as soon as Othello expresses a doubt (I. 231)—'And yet, how nature erring from itself' (meaning human nature)—Iago seizes upon this general reflection on human weakness² to make, in a manner which recalls words of Brabantio's,³

¹ Cf. Peter Alexander, *Shakespeare's Life and Art* (London, 1939), p. 164: 'the malignity of the world, drawn to a head in Iago, makes a breach in the Moor's confidence where it is most manly and modest.'

² See Alice Walker and J. Dover Wilson, Cambridge edn., p. 185.

³ 'For nature so preposterously to err' (I. iii. 62) and

A maiden never bold,
Of spirit so still and quiet that her motion
Blush'd at herself; and she—in spite of nature,
Of years, of country, credit, every thing—
To fall in love with what she fear'd to look on!
It is a judgment maim'd and most imperfect
That will confess perfection so could err
Against all rules of nature . . . (I. iii. 94-101)

his most vicious suggestion—that Desdemona married him out of perversity, and not for any merits he may have possessed.¹ When Iago is able to suggest without opposition from Othello that repentance by Desdemona for having married him would really be in the nature of a 'recoiling to her better judgment', the point has been reached where Othello has lost faith in himself. It is now only a short step to his loss of faith in Desdemona. In the following speech he instructs Iago,

If more thou dost perceive, let me know more;
Set on thy wife to observe. Leave me, Iago. (III. iii. 243-4)

and from now on Iago can proceed to the practical details of his plot, which are based on Othello's desire for evidence that follows from his loss of faith in his wife.²

How decisive is Iago's victory? Once he has gained the ascendancy over Othello's soul, it is certainly true that Othello begins to see the world through Iago's eyes, and that he begins in a sense to turn into Iago. This change, as W. H. Clemen³ and M. M. Morozov⁴ have pointed out, is indicated by Othello's use of Iago's kind of imagery, which predominantly consists of images of 'beasts, represented as embodiments of foolishness, lechery and all kinds of loathsome vices'.⁵ This metamorphosis, however, is also shown in other, more direct ways. The fact that Othello is now jealous, and that he thinks of revenge, of itself makes him akin to his tormentor. The change is also seen in his adoption of the view of love as a matter of private property. Employing the same terms as Iago and Brabantio, he declares that

He that is robb'd, not wanting what is stol'n,
Let him not know't, and he's not robb'd at all. (III. iii. 346-7)

His newly acquired view of love as a commodity is most fully developed in the 'brothel' scene (IV. ii). The full extent of the change here may be appreciated when we compare Othello's 'there's money for your pains' (IV. ii. 94) with his declaration on his first appearance:

But that I love the gentle Desdemona,
I would not my unhoused free condition

¹ See III, iii. 233-7, quoted on p. 12.

² Some critics not in the Coleridge-Bradley tradition (e.g., F. R. Leavis) try to make capital out of the fact that Iago quickly gains control over Othello. But Iago overcomes Othello so rapidly because, as I have suggested, he succeeds in enlisting Othello's strength against himself.

³ *Shakespeare's Imagery*, pp. 130-2.

⁴ 'The Individualization of Shakespeare's Characters through Imagery', *Shakespeare Survey* 2 (1949), p. 86.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 87.

Put into circumscription and confine
For the seas' worth. (I. ii. 25-28)

But Iago's triumph is never complete. His failure becomes apparent at the very moment when on one level he seems entirely successful. In the scene where Desdemona is killed, the old Othello is already reappearing, brought to life by a sense of the solemnity of the deed he is to perform, which he sees as a sacrifice. Iago has not ultimately been successful, for Othello ultimately remains uninfected by the cynicism which is Iago's all-pervading trait; and he kills Desdemona, not out of a base Iago-like jealousy, but because his love for her is so great. He has seen her as representing the source of order—'Perdition catch my soul | But I do love thee; and when I love thee not | Chaos is come again'—and of all that is good—'If she be false, O, then heaven mocks itself!' He kills her so that what is good may no longer 'mock itself'. More specifically, 'I will kill thee, | And love thee after' (v. ii. 18-19). That is, he kills her so that he can love her after. The fact that in the death scene he uses once more 'the noble Othello music'¹ with its 'lofty and poetic imagery'² emphasizes the nature of his motivation. It is heard in the opening speech, 'It is the cause, it is the cause, my soul—'; and in his declaration to Emilia which recalls both his valuation of his love above 'the seas' worth', and Desdemona's own refusal to consider the 'world' as 'a great price for a small vice' (iv. iii):

Nay, had she been true,
If heaven would make me such another world
Of one entire and perfect chrysolite,
I'd not have sold her for it. (v. ii. 146-9)

It is also heard in the speech which culminates in his self-destruction, when this 'extravagant and wheeling stranger' is completing his tragic circle. The steps leading to that completion are clear. He realizes that Iago has been false and Desdemona true, and undergoes a terrible repentance:

When we shall meet at compt,
This look of thine will hurl my soul from heaven,
And fiends will snatch at it. (v. ii. 276-8)

He now sees that the self-division of what is good is to be found, not in Desdemona, but in himself; and he acts in the same way as he had with her.

¹ G. Wilson Knight, *The Wheel of Fire* (London, 4th edn. 1949), p. 104.

² Morozov, *Shakespeare Survey* 2, p. 86. S. L. Bethell ('Shakespeare's Imagery: the Diabolic Images in *Othello*', *Shakespeare Survey* 5 (1952), p. 64) has argued, with reference to *Othello*, that in poetic drama 'the one attribute that cannot be poetically expressed is that of poetic imagination'. This seems to me incorrect; it is surely a matter of the author's ability.

So they lov'd as love in twain
 Had the essence but in one;
 Two distincts, division none:
 Number there in love was slain.¹

When we come to consider Othello's last great speech, we should remember that it is a part of the entire dramatic movement of the play. This speech, in which he asks his listeners to speak 'of me as I am; nothing extenuate, | Nor set down aught in malice', takes us back to that in which he delivers to the Senate 'a round unvarnish'd tale' of his wooing. The 'Arabian trees' and 'Aleppo' recall the story of his travels, which have now reached their end. If we accuse Othello in the later speech of self-dramatization and untruth, we must also say the same about him in the earlier. In this we shall have been anticipated by Iago, who instructs Roderigo to note 'with what violence she first lov'd the Moor, but for bragging and telling her fantastical lies'² (II. i. 219-21). From the viewpoint of Iago, which is that of a cynic, Othello is of course a sentimentalist and self-dramatizer. But Iago is not Shakespeare, however much some critics may choose to associate themselves with his utterances: he represents, seen in his most general aspect, the conditions in which strength destroys itself. Far from Othello's self-inflicted death and his speech leading up to it indicating a self-dramatizing attitude of mind, they are the result of a process of internal development central to his being. Like all tragic heroes, he is consumed by that which nourishes him. With splendid accuracy he describes himself as 'one that lov'd not wisely, but too well'. When he kills himself, saying with his last words,

I kiss'd thee ere I kill'd thee. No way but this—
 Killing my self, to die upon a kiss.

we have the appropriate consummation of the tragedy of Othello and Desdemona, for each dies for the love of the other.

¹ *The Phoenix and Turtle*, v. 7. Miss Gardner ('The Noble Moor', p. 205) has drawn attention to the relevance of this poem for a consideration of *Othello*.

² Iago is in fact absent from the first speech (in order to fetch Desdemona), but Shakespeare clearly treats him here as if he had been present.

HEYWOOD'S AGES AND SHAKESPEARE

By ERNEST SCHANZER

ECHOES in Heywood's *Ages* of Shakespeare's plays and poems have at various times been pointed out. This inquiry is mainly concerned with further instances, some of which, if accepted, would enable us to date the composition of the first three *Ages* with greater precision than has so far been possible.

But before turning to this it is necessary to deal briefly with the view, still held by some scholars, that the *Ages* are either identical with or a revised version of some plays listed in Henslowe's *Diary* in 1595-6. Its originator was Fleay, who remarked of the *Silver* and *Brazen Ages* that 'these two *Hercules* plays are evidently those acted at the Rose 1595, May 7 and May 23'. As to the *Golden Age* he had 'no doubt that the original form was *Seleo* (Coelo) *et Olympo*, acted at the Rose 1595, Mar. 5', while the first part of the *Iron Age* he thought to be 'probably the same as *Troy* first acted in 1596, June 3'.¹ This view received strong, if sometimes modified, support in high places: from Greg, who declared that 'there can be little doubt' that the two parts of *Hercules*, performed by the Admiral's Men as a new play in May 1595, 'are respectively Heywood's *Silver* and *Brazen Ages*';² from Schelling, who regarded Fleay's identifications as 'all but certain';³ from A. W. Ward, who, while sharing Greg's doubts about Fleay's identification of *Seleo et Olympo* with the *Golden Age* and of *Troye* with the *Iron Age* (Greg thought it more probable that the *Iron Age* was a later expansion into a two-part play of Henslowe's *Troye*),⁴ declared that 'there is every reason for believing that Parts I and II of *Hercules* . . . are respectively the *Silver Age* and *Brazen Age*';⁵ and from Tatlock, who stated that 'what evidence there is points to 1594-6 for the five plays, which were perhaps Heywood's earliest work'.⁶ The theory received its hardest knock from A. M. Clark, who declared that the evidence in its refutation 'is so overwhelming that we are forced simply to assert here that *The Ages* are, beyond the shadow of a doubt, dramatizations of Heywood's own *Troia Britannica*'.⁷ But, by not disclosing what this evidence is, Dr. Clark made it possible for the theory to be resurrected in a much

¹ *A Biographical Chronicle of the English Drama* (London, 1891), i. 283-5.

² *Henslowe's Diary*, ed. Greg (London, 1908), ii. 175.

³ *Elizabethan Drama* (Boston, Mass., 1908), ii. 20.

⁴ *Henslowe's Diary*, ii. 180.

⁵ *C.H.E.L.*, vi. 92-93.

⁶ 'The Siege of Troy in Shakespeare and Heywood', *P.M.L.A.*, xxx (1915), 718.

⁷ *Thomas Heywood* (Oxford, 1931), p. 63.

modified form by Allan Holaday. Mr. Holaday conceded that the *Golden Age* is simply a dramatization of the first five cantos of *Troia Britannica*, which it follows closely in content, wording, and structure. But he points out that in the other *Ages*, especially the *Silver* and *Brazen Ages*, Heywood drew much more intermittently on *Troia Britannica*, neither did he go back to its main source, Caxton's *Recuyell*, for his additional material. He therefore suggests that much of this was supplied by Henslowe's Hercules and Troy plays. Whether Heywood wrote these Hercules plays or not, Mr. Holaday believes 'he must have had them at hand nearly two decades later when he prepared the *Silver* and *Brazen Ages*'.¹ This view was supported by F. S. Boas in his brief reference to the problem² and there the matter now rests. Mr. Holaday's evidence for his categorical assertion is, in fact, the same as that which prompted Fleay and Greg to theirs: the occurrence in Henslowe's property and wardrobe lists of certain items, such as a lion's skin, Cerberus's three heads, a golden fleece, and others,³ which are also required for the staging of the *Silver* and *Brazen Ages*. It is on this fact, and on the records of Heywood's connexion with the Admiral's Men in the late 90's, that all the theories connecting the *Ages* with Henslowe's plays rest. That this should have been accepted as strong evidence is astonishing. For it is difficult to conceive of a Hercules play on the popular stage (and hence not following the two Senecan dramas) which would not have required many of these properties. And that a Hercules play very different from Heywood's had been seen on the stage is suggested by his own statement in the *Apology for Actors*:

To see as I have seene, Hercules, in his owne shape, hunting the boare, knocking downe the bull, taming the hart, fighting with Hydra, murdering Geryon, slaughtering Diomed, wounding the Stymphalides, killing the Centaurs, pashing the lion, squeezing the dragon, dragging Cerberus in chaynes, and lastly, on his high pyramides writing *Nil ultra*, Oh, these were sights to make an Alexander!⁴

These words are generally taken to allude to the *Silver* and *Brazen Ages*.⁵

¹ 'Heywood's "Troia Britannica" and the "Ages"', *J.E.G.P.*, xlv (1946), 438.

² Thomas Heywood (London, 1950), p. 83.

³ Hercules' 'lymes', like 'the Mores lymes' with which they are coupled (*Henslowe Papers*, ed. Greg, p. 114, l. 25), cannot refer to parts of the body, as Malone (1821 *Variorum* edition, iii. 309 n. 1), Fleay (*Chron. Hist. London Stage*, p. 115), and Greg (*Henslowe Papers*, p. 114, n. 25) all imply. For in none of the many variants of his legend is Hercules ever dismembered. Besides, if these 'lymes' had been parts of the body they would not have been entered in Henslowe's inventory of wardrobe but in his list of properties. 'Lymes' here almost certainly has the meaning of *O.E.D. limb* z.c. pl.: 'The pieces of a suit of armour', though *O.E.D.*'s earliest instance of this usage is found in Davenant's *Gondibert* (1651).

⁴ Ed. Collier (London, 1841), p. 21.

⁵ For instance by Clark, *Heywood*, p. 75.

For by 1612, when the *Apology* was written, Heywood would have seen these plays performed on the stage. But, while it would be naïve to take these lines too literally as indicating that all the incidents mentioned formed part of a Hercules play which Heywood saw, they strongly suggest that the play referred to centred on the stage performance of Hercules' twelve labours. In Heywood's plays only two of these are staged (both in the *Silver Age*), the killing of the Centaurs and the dragging of Cerberus in chains, while on the slaying of the Nemean lion (off-stage) we are given a running commentary by Iris (p. 130).¹ Though the title-page of the *Brazen Age* tells us (for catchpenny reasons?) that the fifth act contains 'the Labours and death of *Hercules*', none of his labours are enacted in that play, but are merely mentioned by the presenter and Hercules' companions, and their trophies carried across the stage (p. 247). The Hercules play Heywood had in mind in the *Apology* may have been Henslowe's two-part play of 1595 or some other lost play on that subject. That Hercules was no rare visitor on the Elizabethan stage three quotations may illustrate: Sidney's description of Dametas 'leaning his hands vpon his bil, & his chin vpon his hands, with the voice of one that plaieth *Hercules* in a play';² the declaration of a player in Greene's *Groatworth of Wit* (1592), 'The twelue labors of *Hercules* haue I terribly thundred on the stage';³ and Bottom's 'I could play Ercles rarely, or a part to tear a cat in, to make all split.'⁴

There would seem to be, then, not a scrap of evidence to connect the *Silver* and *Brazen Ages* with Henslowe's Hercules plays. And as the identification of the *Iron Age* with the 1596 *Troye* only derives from this supposed connexion and has nothing by itself to commend it (much less Fleay's discovery of the *Golden Age* in the mysterious *Seleo et Olympo*),⁵ the whole attempt to connect the *Ages* with plays on Henslowe's list can be dismissed as a mare's nest. That they were written after *Troia Britannica* (published in 1609) many echoes of that poem in all the *Ages* make clear. Is it possible to determine the date of their composition more precisely?

¹ All page references are to Pearson's reprint of *Heywood's Dramatic Works*, vol. iii.

² *Arcadia* (1590), i. 13. 4.

³ Ed. Grosart, xii. 131.

⁴ *M.N.D.*, i. ii. 23-24. As *M.N.D.* was probably written not many months after the performances by the Admiral's Men of the two parts of *Hercules* in their 1595 season, Bottom's demonstration of 'Ercles' vein, a tyrant's vein' may well be burlesquing the protagonist's style of acting in that play, even if, as has been maintained, the words themselves parody passages in Jasper Heywood's translation of Seneca's *Hercules Furens* (1581).

⁵ My guess is that the title of the play was *Celio and Olimpio* (Henslowe spells it three times 'Olempeo', once 'Olimpio') and that 'Olempeo & heugenyo' (transcribed 'hengens' by Malone and 'hengenyo' by Fleay and Greg, but 'heugenyo' by R. A. Foakes in his forthcoming edition of the *Diary*) was entitled *Olimpio and Eugenio*, and was either identical with it or a sequel to it. Olimpio, Celio, and Eugenio are all three Spanish and Italian male baptismal names with a literary flavour and the play was presumably based on romance material in either of these languages.

That depends on the persuasiveness of the evidence set out below, connecting the *Golden Age* with *The Winter's Tale* and the *Silver Age* with *The Tempest*. In what follows I shall briefly discuss apparent Shakespeare echoes in all four of the *Ages*. Unless otherwise indicated these have not, to my knowledge, been previously pointed out.

As has often been noticed, the first three *Ages* share with *Pericles* the device of using as the presenter of each play the poet from whose work the stories that are dramatized are pretended to be taken: Gower in the one case, Homer in the other.¹ But the resemblance goes a good deal beyond this. Both poet-presenters upon their first appearance speak of the performance that is to follow as the singing by them of an old song:

Gower: To sing a song that old was sung,
From ashes ancient Gower is come (*Pericles*, I Prologue);

Homer: Oh then suffer me,
You that are in the worlds decrepit Age,
When it is neere his vniuersall graue,
To sing an old song. (p. 6)

And in most of the prologues that are prefixed to each of the subsequent acts in both *Pericles* and the *Golden Age* the same pattern is adhered to: the first part of the prologue is followed by a dumb-show, portraying some incident, essential to the plot, which is not dramatized, and this is followed by the remainder of the prologue. I know of no other play where precisely this pattern is found.² Heywood may, of course, have been the author of the Gower prologues and merely have imitated in the *Ages* his own earlier practice. H. D. Gray has made out a very strong case for Heywood's authorship of the non-Shakespearean parts of *Pericles*.³ What seems inconceivable is that the Homer prologues should have been written without any knowledge of those in *Pericles*.

In the *Golden Age* there is one scene which it is difficult to read without being reminded of *The Winter's Tale*. It is the one in which Saturn's mother, Vesta, comes to him to plead for the life of the child to which his wife, the Queen, has just given birth, and which he is bound by oath to destroy (p. 13 ff.). Though there are few, if any, close verbal echoes, this scene brings forcibly to mind that in which Paulina visits Leontes with the new-born child to plead for its mother. It is above all a similarity of

¹ That the Homer prologues are not found in the *Iron Age*, where, for the first time, Heywood really does, occasionally, draw on Homeric material, is an entertaining paradox, but was, no doubt, prompted by the recognition that this play is too much in the medieval, anti-Homeric tradition to make Homer's appearance as presenter any longer tolerable.

² In one of his earliest plays, *The Foure Prentises of London*, Heywood had used a prologue with four interspersed dumb-shows (Pearson, ii. 175-8).

³ *P.M.L.A.*, xl (1925), 507-29.

dramatic situation and incident: the outspoken woman pleading with the King, accusing him of tyranny, his angry outbursts, his wavering mind ('I am a feather for each wind that blows', *W.T.*, II. iii. 153), his repentance, followed by his determination to lead a life of penance and sorrow. Among the more detailed resemblances one may compare the Queen's

Sweet Lad, I would thy father saw thee smile,
Thy beauty and thy pretty Infancy,
Would molifie his heart wer't hew'd from flint (p. 16)

with Paulina's 'We do not know | How he may soften at the sight o' th' child' (II. ii. 39-40); and Vesta's 'Tyrant, I will' (p. 15; not in *Troia Britannica*) with Paulina's 'What studied torments, tyrant, hast for me?' (III. ii. 172). Contiguous with this scene, in the one case immediately preceding, in the other directly following upon it, we have in both plays the description of Apollo's oracle at Delphos. In the *Golden Age* we find,

After our *Ceremonious* Rites perform'd,
And *Sacrifice* ended with *reuerence*,
A murmuring *thunder* hurried through the *Temple*.

(p. 13; my italics)

That the italicized words also occur in the corresponding account in *The Winter's Tale* (III. i) means little by itself, for they are just the words one would expect in any description of the oracle. It is their juxtaposition with the scene discussed above which makes the resemblance significant.

If the likelihood of indebtedness in these scenes is conceded (and I think the evidence strong but by no means conclusive), it still remains to decide who borrowed from whom. It is not an easy problem, even though the sources of both plays, *Pandosto* and *Troia Britannica*, are available for comparison.¹ At first sight the fact that Paulina's visit to Leontes has no parallel in *Pandosto* (the character is Shakespeare's invention), while Vesta's visit to Saturn follows fairly closely its counterpart in *Troia Britannica*, would seem to point to Shakespeare as the borrower. On the other side must be weighed the fact that, while Heywood follows *Troia Britannica* almost slavishly in his dramatization of its episodes, there is one notable exception to this. In the poem Saturn himself visits the oracle at Delphos and receives its pronouncements, whereas in the play it is reported to him by a lord. This change is all the more surprising as, throughout the *Ages*, Heywood delighted in spectacular stage-effects. And only a few years earlier, in *The Rape of Lucrece*,² he had staged a

¹ For instance, the fact that in both plays the condemned babe is referred to by the king as 'the brat' does not help us to decide, for the phrase is applied to it in this context in both *Troia Britannica* (i. 42. 8; 46. 5) and *Pandosto*.

² Pearson, v. 184.

Delphic oracle scene. Could it have been Shakespeare's example which here turned him from his usual practice? This fact, and the general pattern of Shakespearian echoes throughout the *Ages* makes it, after all, seem to me more likely that Heywood was the borrower.

In the *Silver Age* we encounter a rather similar case. There is one scene, given over to Ceres and the Rape of Proserpina (and owing scarcely anything to *Troia Britannica*), in which we are repeatedly reminded of *The Tempest*. And again it is impossible to prove indebtedness because of the absence of clear verbal echoes. Instead there is the close collocation of a variety of elements reminiscent of Shakespeare's play: Ceres' appearance 'with a company of Swaines, and country Wenches' and her blessing of their harvest 'with plenty and increase' (p. 134); Mercury's Ariel-like utterances (and we must remember that Ariel has as much of Mercury in his composition as of the Shakespearian fairy and the Neoplatonic daemon):

as swift as lightning

I search't the regions of the vpper world,
And euery place about the firmament.
I haue past the planets, soar'd quite through the spheares;
I haue crost the Articke and Antarticke poles . . . (p. 138);

Triton's speech with its collocation of water-nymphs, coral, and pearl (ibid.); and throughout the play there are the frequent descents of Juno and Iris in one another's company. The concentration into one scene of elements spread over the whole of *The Tempest* strongly suggests that, if there was indebtedness, it was Heywood who was echoing Shakespeare and not Shakespeare Heywood. And if the case for the *Tempest* echoes is granted, it is not difficult to see what should have set them off when Heywood came to write the scene dealing with the Rape of Proserpina: the stage-appearance of Ceres and her reference to 'The means that dusky Dis my daughter got' in the marriage-masque of *The Tempest* (iv. i. 89).

In the *Brazen Age* there is one scene containing apparent echoes of *Antony and Cleopatra*. In his *Comparison of Demetrius with Antonius*¹ Plutarch had likened Antony's relationship with Cleopatra to that of Hercules with Omphale, and the parallel, implicit throughout much of Shakespeare's play with its many Hercules allusions, seems to have suggested Cleopatra's 'Then put my tires and mantles on him, whilst | I wore his sword Philippan' (II. v. 22-23). Conversely, Heywood, in depicting Hercules' bondage to the Lydian Queen and his breaking of his fetters, seems to have had *Antony and Cleopatra* much in mind. Roused

¹ p. 951 in the 1612 edition of North's translation.

from his effeminate subjection by the scorn and mockery of the visiting Greek heroes, Hercules exclaims:

What strumpet's this that hath detain'd my soule?
Captiu'd my fame, trans-shap't me to a foole?
Made me (of late) but little lesse then God,
Now scarce a man? (p. 245)

(Compare with this Philo's description of Antony as 'The triple pillar of the world transformed | Into a strumpet's fool.' I. i. 12-13.) He declares that he will 'shake off this effeminacy | And by our deeds repurchase our renowne' (p. 246). Omphale, abandoned by him, announces that she will not 'loose him thus', but, like Cleopatra in the same situation, 'What either beauty, cunning, flattery, teares | Or womans Art can, we will practise on him' (ibid.).

Earlier in the scene Hercules'

but for one smile,
I'll make her Empresse ore the triple world,
And all the beauteous Quenes from East to West,
The *Lydians* vassails, and my fellow-slaues (p. 242)

recalls Antony's

I will piece
Her opulent throne with kingdoms; all the east,
Say thou, shall call her mistress. (I. v. 45-47)

As with the *Winter's Tale* and *Tempest* parallels, the echoes are found in the substance rather than the wording, as one would expect with plays of which no printed text was available, so that Heywood would have had to rely on memories of stage-performances. That where such a text was available Heywood was not unwilling to imitate wording as well as substance is shown in his borrowings from *Venus and Adonis* in his treatment of that story in the *Brazen Age* (p. 184 ff.). The full extent of these borrowings has been set out by R. G. Martin.¹

It is shown again in the *Iron Age*, Part I, where the 1609 Quarto of *Troilus and Cressida* was presumably the source of Heywood's borrowings. While the influence of *Troilus and Cressida* on this play is pervasive, ranging from characterization (most notably in the case of Thersites, who is closely, if intermittently, modelled on his Shakespearian counterpart) to incident (such as the murder of Hector by the Myrmidons, set on by Achilles), there are also closer verbal similarities than in the cases discussed so far. This is particularly marked in Hector's speech to Ajax before their combat and immediately after it (pp. 299, 300; *T. & C.*, IV. v. 120 ff.),

¹ 'Notes on Thomas Heywood's *Ages*', *M.L.N.*, xxxiii (1918), 27.

of which Swinburne said, with pardonable exaggeration, that 'the very text of Shakespeare is followed with exceptional and almost servile fidelity'.¹

The different way in which memories of a stage-performance and the use of a copy of the play influenced Heywood's work can, I think, be illustrated by comparing this speech in *Troia Britannica* and the *Iron Age*. In *Troia Britannica*, entered at Stationers' Hall on 5 Dec. 1608, and therefore written before the publication in 1609 of the Quarto text of *Troilus and Cressida*, there are signs of memories of a stage-performance of Shakespeare's play. This is indicated both in the description of the death of Hector at the hands of the Myrmidons under Achilles' orders (a variant of the story found elsewhere only in *Troilus and Cressida* and the *Iron Age*) and in the speech under discussion:

Gramercies Cooze, the *Troyan* Heroë spake,
Thou lou'st me best to lay it soundly on,
These noble thoughts thy myxed byrth did take
From vs of *Troy*, and not from *Telamon*:
Our *Dardan* bloud thou in thy arme dost shake,
But when thou fearest: thy Mothers heate is gon:
And onely that remaines to chill thy hart
Which *Troy* disclaymes, and yeilds *Greece* as her part.
And whould to *Ihoue* I knew where that blood ran,
Vnto those Veines I would direct my Speare,
And those in which our Kindred first began,
My hate should spare, as blood to *Hector* deare:

More, I could wish that I might prooue my rage
On some, whose veine no *Troyan* moysture guides,
Thetis arm'd Son, whose heate we must asswage,
Tetydes, or the Elder of the *Atrides*. . . (*Tr. Brit.*, xii. 96-98)

Here merely the gist of Hector's speech in Shakespeare, his wish to fight only against the Greek portion of Ajax' body, is taken over, with no verbal approximations; not surprisingly, for Heywood was probably relying on memories of a performance of *Troilus and Cressida* seen several years earlier. In the treatment of the speech in the *Iron Age* we have moved a good deal closer to Shakespeare's lines, even though the wording makes clear that in writing it he had *Troia Britannica* open beside him.

And Cuz, by *Ioue* thou hast a braue aspect,
It cheeres my blood to looke on such a foe:
I would there ran none of our *Troian* blood
In all thy veines, or that it were diuided

¹ *Nineteenth Century*, No. 218 (1895), 655.

From that which thou receiuest from *Telamon*:
 Were I assured our blood possest one side,
 And that the other; by Olimpicke *Ioue*,
 I'd thrill my Iauelin at the *Grecian* moysture,
 And spare the *Troian* blood: *Aiæx* I loue it
 Too deare to shed it, I could rather wish
Achilles the halfe god of your huge army,
 Had beene my opposite. (p. 299)

Though in wording the speech is much closer to that in *Troia Britannica*, in structure it follows mainly Shakespeare's:

Were thy commixtion Greek and Trojan so,
 That thou couldst say 'This hand is Grecian all,
 And this is Trojan; the sinews of this leg
 All Greek, and this all Troy; my mother's blood
 Runs on the dexter cheek, and this sinister
 Bounds in my father's', by Jove multipotent,
 Thou shouldst not bear from me a Greekish member
 Wherein my sword had not impresse made
 Of our rank feud; but the just gods gainsay
 That any drop thou borrow'dst from thy mother,
 My sacred aunt, should by my mortal sword
 Be drained! (IV. v. 124 ff.)

In both speeches the hypothesis of the division is followed by the oath ('by Jove multipotent'; 'by Olimpicke *Ioue*'), the declaration of what would be done to the Greek portion, and the refusal to harm the Trojan part of Ajax.

Only two small points make against the assumption that a copy of the Quarto text of *Troilus and Cressida* was used by Heywood in writing the first part of the *Iron Age*. In his treatment of the council among the Trojans Heywood seems to have been influenced by the corresponding scene in *Troilus and Cressida* in making Cassandra burst in at a critical moment of the debate with her prophecies of doom. At this point both the *Iron Age* (p. 269) and the Folio text of Shakespeare's play (II. ii. 100) give an identical stage-direction: 'Enter Cassandra with her haire about her eares' (Q has 'Enter Cassandra rauiing'). Tatlock may be right in thinking this mere coincidence,¹ especially as the phrase was a fairly common term to indicate distraction, Shakespeare having used it before in *Richard III*, II. ii. 34, while Heywood had used it before in *Edward IV*.² The other point is the apparent echo of a passage omitted

¹ *P.M.L.A.*, xxx (1915), 752 n. 56.

² Pearson, ii. 165.

from the Quarto text of *Troilus and Cressida*. In the *Iron Age* Achilles exclaims:

Dogged Thersites,
I'le cleave thee to thy Nauell if thou op'st
Thy venemous lawes. (p. 327)

In *Troilus and Cressida* Agamemnon uses the phrase, 'When rank Thersites opes his mastic jaws' (I. iii. 73). Coincidence again? Perhaps. Or Heywood may have remembered the phrase from the stage performance, though elsewhere he shows no such evidence of a verbal memory. But the two points taken together suggest the possibility that Heywood may not have read *Troilus and Cressida* in the printed Quarto text but in some manuscript version.¹

The main points of indebtedness between the first part of the *Iron Age* and *Troilus and Cressida* have been set out by Tatlock² and there is no need here to add to his list. His belief that the *Iron Age* preceded *Troilus and Cressida* can be safely dismissed. For not only does it draw extensively on *Troia Britannica* throughout (Tatlock thought the lack of such borrowing outside the scenes dealing with Paris' visit to Sparta evidence of its earlier composition than the poem), but Heywood's remark in his preface to the *Silver Age*, 'wee begunne with *Gold*, follow with *Siluer*, proceede with *Brasse*, and purpose by God's grace, to end with *Iron*' (p. 83), can only be taken to mean that when these words were written the *Iron Age* was 'contemplated, but not yet in existence'.³

A. C. Bradley has pointed out *Hamlet* echoes in the second part of the *Iron Age*.⁴ The Pyrrhus speech in *Hamlet* seems, not surprisingly, echoed in the scenes dealing with the destruction of Troy, while in the scene in which Orestes accuses Clytemnestra of her husband's murder, the

¹ The alternative explanation that Heywood revised his play for publication in 1632, with the Folio text of *T. & C.* by his side, can be discounted, in view of what we know of his mass-production methods.

² *P.M.L.A.*, xxx. 747.

³ Chambers, *The Elizabethan Stage* (Oxford, 1923), iii. 345. Another statement in Tatlock's valuable, pioneering article which needs correction is his remark that 'there is no reason to doubt that Heywood's knowledge [of Homer in the *Iron Age*] came directly from the original' (p. 724). This is disproved by the wording of Hector's challenge and Menelaus' response to it, both of which show manifest traces of Chapman's translation. Cf. Hector's 'Is there in your Troupes | A Knight, whose brest includes so much of valour' (*I.A.*, p. 296) with his 'Amongst you all whose brest includes, the most impulsive minde' (*II.*, vii. 59), and Menelaus' 'shall this proud challenge | Bee intertain'd by none?' (*I.A.*, *ibid.*) with his 'If Hector's honourable proof be entertain'd by none' (*II.*, vii. 82-83). That already in *Troia Britannica* Heywood had drawn on Chapman's translation is made clear by the verbal echoes in the description of the lottery that precedes the combat of Ajax and Hector. In both accounts the lots are cast into Agamemnon's casque (*Tr. Brit.*, xii. 82. 6; *II.*, vii. 153); and both use the identical expression, *as all the soldiers pray'd* (*Tr. Brit.*, xii. 84. 4; *II.*, vii. 159) when Ajax' lot is drawn.

⁴ *Shakespearean Tragedy* (London, 1904), pp. 140, 419 n. 1.

description of the appearance of Agamemnon's ghost, Orestes' reactions to it, and Clytemnestra's inability to see it was unquestionably influenced by the corresponding scene in *Hamlet*, though there are also echoes of Hamlet's first encounter with the ghost.

Helen's declaration that she would 'with her nayles teare out these shining balls | That haue set *Troy* on fire' (p. 386) seems to echo *Lucrece*, ll. 1471-5.

To conclude. If we accept the evidence of echoes of *The Winter's Tale* in the *Golden Age*, we are able to date the composition of the first three of the *Ages* between the beginning of 1611¹ and the end of that year, for there is every reason to believe that the *Golden*, *Silver*, and *Brazen Ages* were written in that order. If we are unconvinced about the *Winter's Tale* echoes in the *Golden Age* but persuaded about the *Tempest* echoes in the *Silver Age*, then that play and the *Brazen Age* can be dated between the end of 1610, the *terminus a quo* of *The Tempest*, and the end of 1611, when in the preface to the *Golden Age* Heywood speaks of that play as 'the eldest brother of three Ages, that haue aduentured the Stage'.

¹ This date in turn depends on our acceptance of 1 January 1611, when Jonson's *Masque of Oberon* was performed at Court, as providing the *terminus a quo* of *The Winter's Tale*, because of apparent allusions to that masque in *W.T.* iv. iv. 352. However, Professor Allardyce Nicoll has recently argued persuasively that the passage containing these allusions may be an interpolation inserted at a later date (*Sh. Jahrbuch*, xciv (1958), 56-57).

THE
b
exami
found
novels
denom
critici
But I
of char
drama

An ex
reveal
The r
embr
ter by
realis
throu
elucid
stages
trans
To el
the o
a seri
punis
on hi
mine
being
the n
conce

To
Geor
For

¹ 2
ii. 29
³ 2
R.E.

AN IMAGE OF DISENCHANTMENT IN THE NOVELS OF GEORGE ELIOT

By D. R. CARROLL

THE consistency of George Eliot's use of image and symbol is gradually being appreciated; the repetition and modification of image are being examined. But for this examination to have any significance it must be founded on an understanding of the basic common denominator of her novels, to which all else is strictly subservient. She points directly to this denominator in a letter written in 1857 to John Blackwood in reply to his criticism of *Scenes of Clerical Life*:

But I am unable to alter anything in relation to the delineation or development of character, as my stories always grow out of my psychological conception of the *dramatis personae*.¹

An examination of the delineation and development of her main characters reveals an archetypal pattern upon which all her novels are constructed. The main character, usually the heroine, through lack of self-knowledge embraces an illusory way of life; the illusions are stripped from the character by means of successive disenchantments which lead finally through a realistic knowledge of self to regeneration. This movement from illusion through disenchantment to regeneration is very similar to Strauss's final elucidation of the 'dogmatic import of the life of Jesus';² writing of the stages necessary for the attainment of the ideal state of mind, Strauss, as translated by George Eliot, says:

To elevate himself to such a state of mind, man must depart from evil, cast off the old man, crucify the flesh; a change which is essentially connected with a series of sorrows and sufferings. These the former man has deserved as a punishment, but they fall on the new, for the regenerated man, who takes them on himself, though physically and in his empirical character, as a being determined by the senses, he remains the former man; is morally, as an intellectual being, with his changed disposition, become a new man . . . the suffering which the new man, in dying to the old, must perpetually incur through life, being conceived in the representative of mankind, as a death suffered once for all.³

To articulate this moral and psychological progression in her novels George Eliot occasionally uses the Christian symbols cast off by Strauss. For example, she comments omnisciently on Adam Bede as he is sitting

¹ *The George Eliot Letters*, ed. Gordon S. Haight (New Haven and London, 1954-6), ii. 299.

² Dr. David Friedrich Strauss, *The Life of Jesus* (London, 1846).

³ *The Life of Jesus*, iii. 428-9.

in an 'upper room' awaiting Hetty's trial with bread and wine on the table before him:

Deep, unspeakable suffering may well be called a baptism, a regeneration, the initiation into a new state. . . . Doubtless a great anguish may do the work of years, and we may come out from that baptism of fire with a soul full of new awe and new pity. (XLII)

Savonarola tells Romola they must 'die daily by the crucifixion of our selfish will—to die at last by laying our bodies on the altar' (XL); whilst the description of the confines of the roving archery contest in *Daniel Deronda* ends significantly for Gwendolen—'a curve that might be drawn through certain well-known points, such as the Double Oak, the Whispering Stones, and the High Cross' (xiv).

More consistently, however, George Eliot sets about the creation of her own symbols for the articulation of this archetypal pattern. A passage from a well-known letter to Sara Hennell in 1848 defines in detail the phase of disenchantment and also presents in germinal form images and symbols which she is going to use later in her novels:

Alas for the fate of poor mortals which condemns them to wake up some fine morning and find all the poetry in which their world was bathed only the evening before utterly gone—the hard angular world of chairs and tables and looking-glasses staring at them in all its naked prose. It is so in all the stages of life—the poetry of girlhood goes—the poetry of love and marriage—the poetry of maternity—and at last the very poetry of duty forsakes us for a season and we see ourselves and all about us as nothing more than miserable agglomerations of atoms—poor tentative efforts of the Natur Princip to mould a personality. This is the state of prostration—the self-abnegation through which the soul must go, and to which perhaps it must again and again return, that its poetry or religion, which is the same thing, may be a real ever-flowing river fresh from the windows of heaven and the fountains of the great deep—not an artificial basin with grotto work and gold fish.¹

This 'state of prostration' is the key psychological phase leading from illusion to the resurrection of the self, and only when the prose reality of the world and the self is seen in all its nakedness does resurrection become possible. The most immediately striking symbol in this passage, and one which George Eliot uses throughout her novels, is that of 'the hard angular world of chairs and tables and looking-glasses'.² But another important archetypal image is latent in the sentence, 'we see ourselves and all about us as nothing more than miserable agglomerations of atoms', and it is this

¹ *Letters*, i. 264.

² Mrs. Barbara Hardy, in an article to which I am indebted, 'The Moment of Disenchantment in George Eliot's Novels', *R.E.S.*, n.s. v (1954), 256–64, uses this quotation as a starting-point and traces this particular image and its offshoots through the novels.

image
which

In
another

I have
that n
chaoti
a jaw
fernik
specin
smoth
anxiety

The
ments

Georg

At

ment.

the in

encha

The d

night

aggrer

definit

proper

have in

sunshi

The e

passag

using

List

on wh

but of

charac

is an e

She lo

¹ Let

² Co

tout l'u

dans ce

devien

homme

sans co

No. 69

image and its development into a pervasive symbol of disenchantment which I wish to examine.

In an earlier letter, written to Maria Lewis in 1839, George Eliot uses another version of this image to describe her 'irretrievably scattered' wits: I have lately led so unsettled a life and have been so desultory in my employments, that my mind, never of the most highly organised genus, is more than usually chaotic, or rather it is like a stratum of conglomerated fragments that shews here a jaw and rib of some ponderous quadruped, there a delicate alto-relievo of some fernlike plant My mind presents just such an assemblage of disjointed specimens of history, ancient and modern . . . all arrested and petrified and smothered by the fast thickening every day accession of actual events, relative anxieties, and household cares and vexations.¹

The 'agglomerations of atoms' and the 'stratum of conglomerated fragments' are preparatory stages necessary to a full understanding of the use George Eliot makes of ruins as images and symbols in her novels.

At first George Eliot employs similes to convey the impact of disenchantment. Janet Dempster's mental confusion and self-despair are depicted by the image of sunshine on ruins; this is the culmination of earlier disenchantments and now the ruins are for the first time seen clearly:

The daylight changes the aspect of misery to us, as of every thing else. In the night it presses on our imagination—the forms it takes are false, fitful, exaggerated; in broad day it sickens our sense with the dreary persistence of definite measurable reality. The man who looks with ghastly horror on all his property aflame in the dead of night, has not half the sense of destitution he will have in the morning when he walks over the ruins lying blackened in the pitiless sunshine. (xvi)

The emphasis here is clearly upon the daylight-night antithesis, but the passage is noteworthy as the first example in the novels of George Eliot's using the image of ruins to convey the 'state of prostration'.

Lisbeth Bede's desolation after her husband's death is the next occasion on which the ruin image is used. She is only a minor character in the novel, but often in George Eliot the lesser characters develop parallel to the main characters. In this Pascalian² image the physical confusion of environment is an extension of the confusion of mind:

She looked round with blank eyes at the dirt and confusion on which the bright

¹ *Letters*, i. 29.

² Compare Pascal's 'En voyant l'aveuglement et la misère de l'homme, en regardant tout l'univers muet, et l'homme sans lumière, abandonné à lui-même et comme égaré dans ce recoin de l'univers, sans savoir qui l'y a mis, ce qu'il y est venu faire, ce qu'il deviendra en mourant, incapable de toute connaissance, j'entre en effroi, comme un homme qu'on aurait porté endormi dans une île déserte et effroyable, et qui s'éveillerait sans connaître où il est et sans moyen d'en sortir'. (*Pensées et opuscules* (Paris, 1946), No. 693.)

afternoon's sun shone dimly; it was all of a piece with the sad confusion of her mind—that confusion which belongs to the first hours of a sudden sorrow, when the poor human soul is like one who has been deposited sleeping among the ruins of a vast city, and wakes up in dreary amazement, not knowing whether it is the growing or the dying day—not knowing why and whence came this illimitable scene of desolation, or why he too finds himself desolate in the midst of it. (x)

Dinah comes to visit Lisbeth and prepares us for her later role in relation to the major characters by literally clearing up first Lisbeth's external and then, by extension, her mental confusion.

Maggie Tulliver, like the majority of George Eliot's heroines, has to undergo two disenchantments before she arrives at the state of regeneration at the very end of the novel. Book Four of *The Mill on the Floss* is concerned principally with describing the first of these disenchantments after her father's bankruptcy, when 'no dream-world would satisfy her now' (III). The book opens in this way:

Journeying down the Rhone on a summer's day, you have perhaps felt the sunshine made dreary by those ruined villages which stud the banks in certain parts of its course, telling how the swift river once rose, like an angry destroying god, sweeping down the feeble generations whose breath is in their nostrils, and making their dwellings a desolation . . . these dead-tinted, hollow-eyed, angular skeletons of villages on the Rhone oppress me with the feeling that human life—very much of it—is a narrow, ugly, grovelling existence, which even calamity does not elevate, but rather tends to exhibit in all its bare vulgarity of conception; and I have a cruel conviction that the lives these ruins were the traces of were part of a gross sum of obscure vitality that will be swept into the same oblivion with the generations of ants and beavers.

The purpose of this passage is to disengage the reader momentarily from his close involvement in the 'old-fashioned family life on the banks of the Floss' in which he has been directly participating through the eyes of Tom and Maggie, and to remove him to an omniscient position from which he can appreciate the significance of its 'oppressive narrowness' in the development of Maggie's character. George Eliot no longer uses the similes of ruins but a description of actual ruins as an 'objective correlative' of Maggie's disenchantment. Here there is no comparison made between a character in the novel and a person deposited amidst the ruins of a city; the ruins on the Rhone had become, in T. S. Eliot's words, 'a set of objects, a situation, a chain of events which shall be the formula of that *particular* emotion; such that when the external facts, which must terminate in sensory experience, are given, the emotion is immediately evoked'.¹

It is interesting to note that at the end of the novel, at the moment of

¹ In his essay, 'Hamlet', *Selected Essays 1917-1932* (London, 1932), p. 145.

Maggie
does
Ogg's
mutual
self is
stincti

By
sively
termin
Rom
of the
his ho
conve
adept
tradit
his su

If v
of Ro
modif
Tito
the ca
(xxvi
librar

It was
and ca
the pr
dream
men v
the co
every
hersel
was b

For F
of 18
she is
appre
chaos
confu
of th
'amor
attitu

Maggie's second and ultimate disenchantment, 'the swift river' actually does rise 'like an angry destroying god', bringing punishment upon St. Ogg's, condemned by Dr. Kenn for its 'want of fellowship and sense of mutual responsibility' (Bk. 7. 11). Simultaneously Maggie's dream of self is finally dispelled when, amidst the general ruin, she sets out instinctively to save Tom.

By the time of *Romola*, George Eliot is using the image more unobtrusively, for now she seems to accept it intuitively as part of her psychological terminology. For example, she employs it to convey Tito's dread of Romola's discovering his past: 'Tito awaited her, with a sickening sense of the sunlight that slanted before him and mingled itself with the ruin of his hopes' (xvii). It is the combination of the sunlight and the ruins which converts this from an undistinguished metaphor into a striking and adept underlining of an important psychological phase. Tito's 'moral tradition' which has 'no memories of self-conquest' (xxxix) is a result of his successive escapes from imminent disenchantments.

If we look at the contrapuntal theme in this novel, namely the creation of Romola's opposite 'moral tradition', then we shall find a significant modification of the ruin image. Romola's growing disappointment with Tito reaches a climax when he sells, unknown to her, her father's library, the care and disposal of which was a 'sacramental obligation' to Romola (xxvii). We see her at the culmination of her disenchantments when the library is about to be removed:

It was more than three weeks before the contents of the library were all packed and carried away. And Romola instead of shutting her eyes and ears, had watched the process. The exhaustion consequent on violent emotion is apt to bring a dreamy disbelief in the reality of its cause; and in the evening when the workmen were gone, Romola took her hand-lamp and walked slowly round amongst the confusion of straw and wooden cases, pausing at every vacant pedestal, every well-known object laid prostrate, with a sort of bitter desire to assure herself that there was a sufficient reason why her love was gone and the world was barren for her. (xxxvi)

For Romola this is the departure of what George Eliot called in her letter of 1848 'the poetry of love and marriage'; by means of her hand-lamp she is making certain that it has been replaced by the 'naked prose'. To appreciate the full significance of this scene we must remember that this chaos of 'well-known objects' which, as well as creating, externalizes the confusion of Romola's mind, is her father's collection of salvaged remnants of the past. Early in the novel we come across the blind Bardo seated 'among his books and his marble fragments of the past' expressing his attitude to life: 'For me, Romola, even when I could see, it was with the

great dead that I lived, while the living often seemed to me mere spectres—shadows dispossessed of true feeling and intelligence' (v); this escapist attitude to the prose reality of life looks forward to Casaubon in *Middlemarch* whose eyesight is also, symbolically, deteriorating:

I feed too much on the inward sources; I live too much with the dead. My mind is something like the ghost of an ancient, wandering about the world and trying mentally to construct it as it used to be, in spite of ruin and confusing changes. (ii)

These ruins, these 'fragments of the past', still symbolize a state of disenchantment, but with the additional implication that the disillusioned person will not progress towards regeneration because he refuses to face the 'naked prose' of this present reality. Hence when we see Romola in the confusion of the library we must interpret the scene on two levels: the confusion of the library signifies that it is about to be removed and so symbolizes her disillusionment with Tito; but the fact that these confused objects are her father's 'fragments of the past' makes them a symbol of the false approach to life taught her by her father—

She had been brought up in learned seclusion from the interests of actual life, and had been accustomed to think of heroic deeds and great principles as something antithetic to the vulgar present, of the Pnyx and the Forum as something more worthy of attention than the councils of living Florentine men. (xxvii)

—and of the added disenchantment consequent upon her gradual realization of the futility of this attitude. The 'ruins' have emerged from the similes of *Janet's Repentance* and *Adam Bede* into symbolic actuality as Bardo's 'marble fragments of the past'.

In *Felix Holt*, the image is realized with amazing actuality and significance in the description of Transome Court. As we read the first chapter of the novel, the decrepit house becomes the fifteen years of Mrs. Transome's disillusioned waiting which have elapsed since her son left her. In this highly charged atmosphere of disenchantment and fearful anticipation, objects are quickly transmuted into symbols. 'There was a great deal of tarnished gilding and dinginess on the walls and furniture of this smaller room'—such an external detail becomes, by the end of the chapter, descriptive of character:

Mrs. Transome had been in her bloom before this century began, and in the long painful years since then, what she had once regarded as her knowledge and accomplishments had become as valueless as old-fashioned stucco ornaments, of which the substance was never worth anything, while the form is no longer to the taste of any living mortal. (i)

Her perpetually disenchanted condition is aggravated on the occasions

when s
metaph
Mrs. T
been bri
dreary a

At the
suprem
But bel
disench
'stratum
and so
togethe
George
is forth

It seem
in one s
that the
temple
are an u

From I
no such

We l
and syn
fragme
of ator
in the
past w
Romol
charac
Doroth
to Cas
illusion
and cr
... let

¹ See
James',
writers
Lady.

² Lac
to ruins
was a s
felt her

when she meets Jermy; after one of these meetings, we have a terse, metaphoric continuation of the previous ruin images:

Mrs. Transome shivered as she stood alone; all around her, where had once been brightness and warmth, there were white ashes, and the sunshine looked dreary as it fell on them. (ix)

At the climax of the novel, it is Esther's 'vision' of Mrs. Transome in her supreme grief which is the deciding factor in her final choice of Felix. But before this climax we have witnessed Esther in one of *her* crises of disenchantment, her mental condition reminiscent of George Eliot's 'stratum of conglomerated fragments': 'Her life was a heap of fragments and so were her thoughts: some great energy was needed to bind them together' (xv). And just before her final choice at the end of the novel George Eliot indicates the next stage in the metaphor—if the 'great energy' is forthcoming the fragments become a 'temple':

It seemed to her that she stood at the first and last parting of the ways. And, in one sense, she was under no illusion. It is only in that freshness of our time that the choice is possible which gives unity to life, and makes the memory a temple where all relics and all votive offerings, all worship and all grateful joy, are an unbroken history sanctified by one religion. (XLIV)

From her experience of Transome Court she has learnt that she will find no such temple there as the wife of Harold Transome.

We have the culmination and aggregation of all the previous ruin images and symbols in Dorothea's visit to Rome in *Middlemarch*.¹ The 'stupendous fragmentariness' (xx) of Rome goes back directly to the 'agglomerations of atoms' and the 'conglomerated fragments' of the early letters, whilst in the different attitudes of the characters to the chaos of Rome and its past we have further variations on the historic idea already noticed in *Romola*. First, we must look at Rome from the point of view of Dorothea's character development. Before she arrives at her final state of regeneration, Dorothea has to undergo two principal disenchantments—her marriage to Casaubon, and the short-lived despair over the apparently 'detected illusion' (LXXX), Ladislaw.² Her visit to Rome with Casaubon precipitates and crystallizes the first disenchantment:

... let them conceive one more historical contrast: the gigantic broken revela-

¹ See Q. D. Leavis, 'A Note on Literary Indebtedness: Dickens, George Eliot, Henry James', *Hudson Review*, viii (1955), 423-8. Mrs. Leavis compares the use of the three writers make of Rome in their novels, *Little Dorrit*, *Middlemarch*, and *The Portrait of a Lady*.

² Ladislaw's annoyance with Rosamund on his 'detection' reduces *her* dream world to ruins: 'the terrible collapse of the illusion towards which all her hope had been strained was a stroke which had too thoroughly shaken her: her little world was in ruins, and she felt herself tottering in the midst as a lonely bewildered consciousness'. (LXXVIII)

tions of that Imperial and Papal city thrust abruptly on the notions of a girl who had been brought up in English and Swiss Puritanism, fed on meagre Protestant histories and on art chiefly of the hand-screen sort. . . . The weight of unintelligible Rome might lie easily on bright nymphs to whom it formed a background for the brilliant picnic of Anglo-foreign society; but Dorothea had no such defence against deep impressions. Ruins and basilicas, palaces and colossi, set in the midst of a sordid present, where all that was living and warm-blooded seemed sunk in the deep degeneracy of a superstition divorced from reverence; the dimmer but yet eager Titanic life gazing and struggling on walls and ceilings; the long vistas of white forms whose marble eyes seemed to hold the monotonous light of an alien world: all this vast wreck of ambitious ideals, sensuous and spiritual, mixed confusedly with the signs of breathing forgetfulness and degradation, at first jarred her as with an electric shock, and then urged themselves on her with that ache belonging to a glut of confused ideas which check the flow of emotion. (LXXX)

This passage develops powerfully 'the fine bit of antithesis' noticed by Naumann in the previous chapter when we come upon Dorothea standing beside the statue of Ariadne in the Vatican. But it is only when we place the passage in the context of Dorothea's psychological progression through the novel that we realize its most significant purpose. The impact of the 'stupendous fragmentariness' of Rome upon Dorothea is as it is because she is passing through the phase of disenchantment when 'we see ourselves and all about us as nothing more than miserable agglomerations of atoms'. In her use of the ruins of Rome in this novel, George Eliot has passed emphatically from the merely adjectival description of a mental phase to the truly symbolic realization.

As a vividly realized symbol the ruins of Rome have more than one purpose in the novel. We have already seen Casaubon at the beginning of the novel comparing his mind to 'the ghost of an ancient . . . trying mentally to construct [the world] as it used to be, in spite of ruin and confusing changes' (II); when he visits Rome with Dorothea we see his mind vainly working amidst the ruins. Between the two, George Eliot has prepared us for the significance of his visit by a consistent use of metaphor. Before the marriage, Ladislav has been amused by Casaubon's 'plodding application, rows of note-books, and small tapers of learned theory exploring the tossed ruins of the world' (x), whilst in the same chapter the taper image is repeated when George Eliot says that for Casaubon the prospect of marriage did not 'prove persistently more enchanting to him than the accustomed vaults where he walked taper in hand' (x). By the time of the visit to Rome Dorothea has come to feel the force of the metaphor:

How was it that in the weeks since her marriage, Dorothea had not distinctly

observ
air whi
ante-ro
The v
to Rom
Poor M
and in
which
forgot
notions
Casau
upon
differ
world
On
the pr
for eve
these
explor
The
medic
She lo
the ra
tomb,
never
And
dema
And m
must
of a tr
By hi
prom
sever
tomb
. . . t
as it
of a f
It
amaz

observed but felt with a stifling depression, that the large vistas and wide fresh air which she had dreamed of finding in her husband's mind were replaced by ante-rooms and winding passages which seemed to lead nowhither? (xx)

The vaults and ante-rooms of the Vatican library have, during the visit to Rome, momentarily replaced the ruin image:

Poor Mr. Casaubon himself was lost among small closets and winding stairs, and in an agitated dimness about Cabeiri . . . easily lost sight of any purpose which had prompted him to these labours. With his taper stuck before him he forgot the absence of windows, and in bitter manuscript remarks on other men's notions about the solar deities, he had become indifferent to the sunlight. (xx)

Casaubon, unlike Janet Dempster, has not the resignation to look back upon the ruins of his life 'lying blackened in the pitiless sunshine'; indifferent to the sunlight he is attempting to construct his own dream-world from amongst 'the tossed ruins of the world'.

On the return from Rome we learn of Casaubon's brief re-entries into the present world of scholarship to avenge himself upon his rivals:

for even when Mr. Casaubon was carrying his taper among the tombs of the past, these modern figures came athwart the dim light, and interrupted his diligent exploration. (xlii)

The ruins have become 'tombs' immediately before Lydgate gives his medical warning to Casaubon, and Dorothea has sensed the change:

She longed for work which would be directly beneficent like the sunshine and the rain, and now it appeared that she was to live more and more in a virtual tomb, where there was the apparatus of a ghastly labour producing what would never see the light. (xlviii)

And when, immediately before his death, Dorothea anticipates what his demands upon her might be, she sees herself working on the ruins of ruins:

And now she pictured to herself the days, and months, and years which she must spend in sorting what might be called shattered mummies, and fragments of a tradition which was itself a mosaic wrought from crushed ruins. . . . (xlviii)

By his death, she escapes from the labour of 'toiling under the fetters of a promise to erect a tomb with his name upon it' (L), with the result that several weeks later Casaubon's notebooks have to suffice as a makeshift tombstone:

. . . the morning gazed calmly on the library, shining on the rows of notebooks as it shines on the weary waste planted with huge stones, the mute memorial of a forgotten faith. (LIV)

It is worth following such an image if only to get some idea of the amazing consistency with which George Eliot uses her images in the

later novels, and of the way in which she transmutes them into symbols. This consistency together with an almost poetic economy of expression bring the mental world of a Casaubon into an intimate and significant relationship with the actual world in which he moves. There is a reciprocal interaction between these two worlds and we have seen how the images prepare us for the significance of actual events, whilst the actual events modify the images meaningfully. It is this use of images which allows George Eliot to combine utmost verisimilitude of incident with a symbolic interpretation. It works on all levels from the maid Tantripp's remark, 'I wish every book in that library was built into a caticom for your master' (XLVIII) to the poignant scene when Dorothea, after a quarrel with Casaubon, 'stood in the darkness waiting for his coming upstairs with a light in his hand' (XLII). The images and symbols of ruins, centring on Rome, have added a significant dimension to the character of Casaubon.

Rome has a further significance in its relation to the third major character who visits it simultaneously with the Casaubons. For Ladislav, it affords an opportunity to exercise his creative imagination; he

passed easily to a half-enthusiastic, half-playful picture of the enjoyment he got out of the very miscellaneousness of Rome, which made the mind flexible with constant comparison, and saved you from seeing the world's ages as a set of box-like partitions without vital connection . . . he confessed that Rome had given him quite a new sense of history as a whole; the fragments stimulated his imagination and made him constructive.

The contrast in what George Eliot calls, in *Daniel Deronda*, the 'historic sympathy' (XXXII) of Casaubon and Ladislav brings out the complete contrast in character. More and more frequently in her later novels George Eliot uses attitudes to the past as an index to character.¹ As early as 1851 in a review of R. W. Mackay's *The Progress of the Intellect* George Eliot expressed her meaning quite explicitly:

It may be doubted, whether a mind which has no susceptibility to the pleasure of changing its point of view, of mastering a remote form of thought, of perceiving identity of nature under variety of manifestation—a perception which resembles an expansion of one's own being, a pre-existence in the past—can possess the flexibility, the ready sympathy, or the tolerance, which characterises a truly philosophic culture.²

This is reminiscent in a modified form of Emerson's essay, 'History' (1841):

The world exists for the education of each man . . . he must transfer the point

¹ For example, the conversation on the restoration of the Abbey in *Daniel Deronda* (XXXV) between Deronda, Grandcourt, and Sir Hugo Mallinger.

² *Westminster Review*, liv (1851), 353.

of view from which history is commonly read, from Rome and Athens and London to himself and not deny his conviction that he is the court. . . . He must attain and maintain that lofty sight where facts yield their secret sense, and poetry and annals are alike. 'The instinct of the mind, the purpose of nature, betrays itself in the use we make of the signal narrations of history. Time dissipates to shining ether the solid angularity of facts'. . . . All history becomes subjective; in other words, there is properly no history; only biography.

And in his next essay, 'Self-Reliance', Emerson describes what happens when 'the solid angularity of facts' proves too much for the imagination, when

he who travels to get somewhat which he does not carry, travels away from himself, and grows old even in youth among old things. In Thebes, in Palmyra, his will and mind have become old and dilapidated as they. He carries ruins to ruins.

The final correlation epitomizes the relationship between Rome and the author of the 'Key to all Mythologies'.

Thus the 'stupendous fragmentariness' of Rome has a different significance in each of the delineations of these three characters. The original image of the early novels has moved gradually from the periphery into the centre of the novels; instead of merely describing a phase of character development it has come now partly to create it and to externalize it symbolically. And because of the reality and complexity of this symbol, its significance changes with its relationship to each character. This is an anticipation of the more consciously defined ambivalence of the symbols of *Daniel Deronda*.

The ruined chapel at the Abbey in *Daniel Deronda* is the final and the most complex use of the ruin symbol in George Eliot's novels. Deronda and Gwendolen, who is quickly becoming disillusioned about Grandcourt, are staying at Sir Hugo's country house, the Abbey:

They walked on the gravel across a green court . . . to find the beautiful choir long ago turned into stables, in the first instance perhaps after an impromptu fashion by troopers, who had a pious satisfaction in insulting the Priests of Baal and the images of Ashtoreth, the queen of heaven. The exterior—its west end, save for the stable door, walled in with brick and covered with ivy—was much defaced, maimed of finial and gargoyle, the friable limestone broken and fretted, and lending its soft gray to a powdery dark lichen; the long windows too were filled in with brick as far as the springing of the arches, the broad clerestory windows with wire or ventilating blinds . . . it had still a scarcely disturbed aspect of antique solemnity, which gave the scene in the interior rather a startling effect. . . . Each finely-arched chapel was turned into a stall, where in the dusty

¹ George Eliot, adapting this sentence, quotes it in a letter to Sara Hennell in 1847 (*Letters*, i. 237-8).

glazing of the windows there still gleamed patches of crimson, orange, blue and palest violet . . . a soft light fell from the upper windows . . . on the hay hanging from racks where the saints once looked down from the altar pieces . . . and on four ancient angels, still showing signs of devotion like mutilated martyrs. . . (xxxv)

The ambivalence of this symbol points to the fundamental unity of this often dismembered novel. The discrete halves of the novel each make a demand upon the titular hero: Gwendolen's vision of fear attempts to force him into the role of her personal redeemer, whilst Mordecai's vision of hope attempts to force him into the role of messiah to the Jews. This double pressure which ultimately educates Deronda out of his disease of sympathy is articulated by one set of symbols. For example, if we look at the chapel from Gwendolen's point of view we see that it is an image of the 'desecrated sanctities' of her married life, and an image of her consequent desire to make Deronda ('who oddly enough had taken off his felt hat and stood holding it before him as if they had entered a room or an actual church') into her absolving priest; and at the end of this chapter George Eliot asserts that 'without the aid of sacred ceremony or costume, her feelings had turned this man . . . into a priest'. If, however, we look at the chapel from the point of view of Mordecai (or from the point of view of a Deronda conscious of Mordecai's claim upon him), we must interpret it as a symbol of the Jewish religion, ignored by the modern Jews who are deprived of their 'organic centre' (xlii) and ignorant of their inheritance. It is an embodiment of Mordecai's Hebrew verses:

Solitude is on the sides of Mount Nebo,
In its heart a tomb:
There the buried ark and golden cherubim
Make hidden light:
There the solemn faces gaze unchanged,
The wings are spread unbroken:
Shut beneath in silent awful speech
The law lies graven.
Solitude and darkness are my covering,
And my heart a tomb;
Smite and shatter it, O Gabriel!
Shatter it as the clay of the founder
Around the golden image. (xxviii)

This second interpretation casts Deronda in the role of Gabriel, a role which he ultimately accepts. He has, like Ladislav, the Emersonian qualities requisite to understand the symbol:

. . . the forms of the Juden-gasse, rousing the sense of union with what is remote, set him musing on two elements of our historic life which that sense raises into

the same region of poetry:—the faint beginnings of faiths and institutions, and their obscure lingering decay; the dust and withered remnants with which they are apt to be covered only enhancing for the awakened perception the impressiveness either of a sublimely penetrating life . . . or of a pathetic inheritance in which all the grandeur and the glory have become a sorrowing memory. (XXXII)

Once again, one's attitude in the face of the ruins of the world is used as an index of character: Bardo and Casaubon contrast with Ladislav and Deronda.

It is impossible to understand fully this final use of the ruin image without a complete knowledge of the whole novel. Esther Lyon's 'heap of fragments' waiting to be formed into a 'temple' were only realized on the mental plane, as milestones of character development; while still performing this basic function, the complex symbol in this final novel is used confidently to interrelate the characters for a definition of the theme of the novel. The image has developed through the novels from an adjectival to a verbal function.

THE PUBLICATION OF *THE TIME MACHINE* 1894-5

By BERNARD BERGONZI

It is generally agreed that H. G. Wells's first novel, *The Time Machine*, is a finer artistic and imaginative achievement than any of his later fiction. In March 1895, when it was appearing as a magazine serial, W. T. Stead wrote, 'Mr. H. G. Wells, who is writing the serial in the *New Review*, is a man of genius',¹ and in recent years Mr. V. S. Pritchett has remarked, 'Without question *The Time Machine* is the best piece of writing. It will take its place among the great stories of our language'.²

Yet *The Time Machine* is remarkable not only for its literary merits, but for its complex bibliographical history, which must be unparalleled among works of modern fiction. The basic facts have already been made known by Wells himself and other writers.³ The earliest draft of the story was called *The Chronic Argonauts* and was serialized in the *Science Schools Journal*, the students' magazine of the Royal College of Science, in 1888. It had only the bare idea of 'time travelling' and a few lines of dialogue in common with the later versions. Wells subsequently made two further drafts, which are lost, and early in 1894, in response to a request by W. E. Henley, he returned to the story and rewrote it as a series of loosely connected articles for the *National Observer*. The first of them appeared in March, and six more were published between March and June, but the series was discontinued after Henley gave up the editorship. These articles have a fairly close resemblance to the story as we now know it, particularly the first of them, but contain only a fraction of the material. Wells, with Henley's encouragement, continued to work on the story, though without any specific plans for its publication. In a newspaper interview given in 1906, Wells stated that *The Time Machine* was written in a fortnight of sustained effort.⁴ If this was so, Wells could only have been referring to a draft of the story, and probably an early one, since letters written to him by Henley in September and November 1894 suggest that the story was still being worked on at that time. At the end of the year Henley took over the editorship of the *New Review* and arranged for the novel to be serialized

¹ *Review of Reviews*, xi (1895), 263.

² *The Living Novel* (London, 1946), pp. 119-20.

³ See H. G. Wells, *Experiment in Autobiography* (London, 1934), i. 309, ii. 515-19, 530; Geoffrey West [Geoffrey H. Wells], *H. G. Wells* (London, 1930), pp. 287-94; Georges Connes, 'La première forme de la Machine à explorer le temps', *Revue Anglo-Américaine*, i (1924), 339-44.

⁴ *New York Herald*, 15 April 1906.

there: it appeared in five instalments from January to May 1895. At the end of May *The Time Machine* was published as a book by William Heinemann, and this version is still in print. It is largely, though not entirely, the same as that serialized in the *New Review*. Some years later Wells made a few minor changes in the text, which mainly consisted of removing the chapter headings and running various chapters together; and this revised text was included in the Atlantic Edition of his works; it has since been reprinted in *The Short Stories of H. G. Wells* and the Everyman's Library edition of *The Wheels of Chance* and *The Time Machine*.

Allowing for minor revisions, this makes seven versions of *The Time Machine*, of which five have survived. But neither Wells nor his commentators have remarked that the first American edition, published in 1895 by Henry Holt and Co. of New York, contains a number of significant variations from both the *New Review* and Heinemann versions. Geoffrey H. Wells, in his bibliography, merely refers to the curious fact that the author's name appears on the title page as 'H. S. Wells'.¹ This American edition was published some time before the British one (copies were received by the Library of Congress on 7 May 1895, and the *Publishers' Weekly* for 18 May lists the book in its 'Weekly Record of New Publications'; the Heinemann edition was not published until 29 May), though it is not listed in I. R. Brussel's bibliography of nineteenth-century works by British authors which were first published in the United States.² It is, in fact, the true first edition.

The differences in the text, however, add considerably to the importance of the American edition. But before discussing them it will be necessary to summarize the differences between the *New Review* and Heinemann texts.³ There are two places in which NR differs substantially from H. The first chapter, 'The Inventor', is much longer, since it corresponds to the first two chapters, 'Introduction' and 'The Machine', of H. And the first part of 'The Inventor' is quite different from 'Introduction' as printed in H. The former contains a lengthy account of the 'Time Traveller' and his friends, and shows them engaging in a somewhat leisurely discussion of the scientific and metaphysical aspects of time-travelling. Wells appears to have inserted into this discussion what may have been part of his early paper, 'The Universe Rigid', which had been accepted by Frank Harris for the *Fortnightly Review* in 1891 and then rejected as 'incomprehensible'.⁴ The first chapter of H opens much more directly and omits this

¹ H. G. Wells: *A Bibliography* (London, 1926), p. 4.

² *Anglo-American First Editions 1826-1900: East to West* (London, 1935).

³ Henceforth the *New Review* version will be referred to by the symbol NR, the Holt edition by NY, and the Heinemann edition by H; NR-H will be used for passages where NR and H are identical.

⁴ Wells, *Experiment in Autobiography* (London, 1934), i. 356-9.

material: the first few pages are in fact a revision of the first of the *National Observer* articles, which had appeared on 17 March 1894. This suggests that the changes made in NR were somewhat provisional and were removed before publication in permanent form. There are some unpublished letters from Henley to Wells which suggest precisely this.¹ On 6 December 1894 Henley wrote:

I am very strongly urged that it would be most unwise to reprint from the *N.O.* What is more, I see the force of the objection. Can you help me to a new first chapter? I send you the existing one. It is hard to beat, I know; but I shall be properly grateful if you'll try.

And the following day he wrote again:

'Tis in your hands, and you must use it as seems best to you. The great thing is not to keep too closely to the old *N.O.*

A postcard dated 12 December, bearing the terse inscription 'Excellent! W. E. H.' can be taken as evidence of the receipt of the new opening chapter from Wells. But it is reasonable to assume that Wells also thought that the original opening had been 'hard to beat', and so took the opportunity to restore it when the novel was published as a book.

The other principal difference between NR and H also concerns certain passages which appear in the former but not in the latter. In Chapter XIII of NR (which becomes Chapter XIV in H), published in the May issue, the 'Time Traveller', after leaving the world of the Eloi and the Morlocks, travels into the remoter future and finds that the remnants of humanity have dwindled into puny creatures like 'some small breed of kangaroo' who are preyed upon by huge monsters resembling centipedes. This episode of about 1,000 words is not reproduced in H, where the Traveller does not stop the machine until he reaches the desolate period when the earth has ceased to rotate and the only visible life consists of giant crabs. The episode is vividly written, but it fits rather uneasily into its context, and it is not surprising that Wells chose to remove it. Curiously enough, however, it was singled out for special praise by W. T. Stead, not only in another laudatory reference made while the serial was appearing, but also in a retrospective article on Wells's work published three years later: Stead had evidently only read *The Time Machine* in the serialized version and had not noticed the disappearance of the 'kangaroo' episode from the book.² In point of fact, this episode also seems to have been

¹ I am indebted to Professor Gordon N. Ray for permission to quote from this correspondence. The originals are in the Library of the University of Illinois.

² 'How the World Will Die', *Review of Reviews*, xi (1895), 416. 'The Latest Apocalypse of the End of the World', *Review of Reviews*, xvii (1898), 389-96.

added as a result of the exigencies of serial publication. In a letter of 1 April 1895 Henley wrote:

Our printers led me a dance last month which ended in the clapping on, against my will, of an extra chapter. Consequently, this last instalment is a little short: it runs in fact to less than nine pages.

Have you any more ideas? I should be glad to have a little more for my last; and it may be that you would not be sorry either. Of course, it would be tommyrot to write in for the sake of lengthening out; but I confess that, as it seems to me, at this point—with all time before you—you might very well give your fancy play, &, at the same time, oblige your editor. The Traveller's stoppings might, for instance, begin some period earlier than they do, & he might even tell us about the last man & his female & the ultimate degeneracy of which they are the proof and the sign. Or—but you are a better hand at it than I! I will add (1) that I honestly believe that to amplify in some such sense will be to magnify the effect of the story; & (2) that I can give you a clear week for the work.

Henley's habit of editorial interference was notorious,¹ but in this case Wells seems to have gracefully agreed to what was suggested. Many years later, however, he remarked in an introduction to *The Time Machine*:

There was a slight struggle between the writer and W. E. Henley who wanted, he said, to put a little 'writing' into the tale. But the writer was in reaction from that sort of thing, the Henley interpolations were cut out again, and he had his own way with the text.²

Apart from the passages just discussed, the only other differences between NR and H consist of the occasional alteration, addition, or removal of single words or short phrases, and a certain modification of the chapter divisions.

NY, however, contains several major differences from both NR and H, and a considerable number of minor ones. The opening of the novel, in particular, differs from both the other two versions. Like NR it contains a long first chapter called 'The Inventor', equivalent to Chapters I and II of H. The first 800 words are identical with NR, but thereafter it corresponds with H. The Traveller's account of the Rigid Universe which comes in Chapter I of NR is not included. This first chapter of NY in fact follows the first *National Observer* article rather more closely than does H. Thus, though the 'Time Traveller' is referred to as such in the first 800 words (as in NR), in the next few pages (corresponding to Chapter I of H) he is called the 'Philosophical Inventor' or the 'Philosophical Person' as in the *National Observer*. In H, on the other hand, he is consistently the 'Time Traveller'. This suggests very strongly that Chapter I of NY was not all written at the same time and that the part of it which

¹ See Kennedy Williamson, *W. E. Henley* (London, 1930), p. 240.

² Wells, *Works* (Atlantic Edition, London, 1924), I. xxi-xxii.

corresponds to Chapter I of H was written first. At the same time, there are certain places where Chapter I of NY follows NR rather than the *National Observer* article or H. The character, for instance, who is called the 'Provincial Mayor' in the *National Observer*, becomes the 'Rector' in NR; in NY he is the 'Provincial Mayor' at the beginning of the chapter and the 'Rector' at the end; in H he is once more the 'Provincial Mayor' throughout. There are other cases where Wells has made several successive alterations of the same phrase. Thus, in the second *National Observer* article, published on 24 March 1894, the Traveller, describing the sensations of time-travelling, remarks, 'the night is like the flapping of a black wing'; in NR and NY this is replaced by the inept phrase, 'day followed night like the flap, flap, flap of some rotating body' (Chapter III); but in H we find once more, 'night followed day like the flapping of a black wing' (Chapter IV).

In Chapter IV of NR and NY there is a curious fossil-like survival of an earlier stage of the story: the Traveller refers there to 'the people of the year Thirty-two thousand odd', whereas in NR, NY, and H the age of the Eloi and Morlocks is A.D. 802701, and in the *National Observer* articles it had been merely A.D. 12203. Evidently Wells had provisionally adopted another date before deciding on one sufficiently far in the future, and it is remarkable that the allusion should have been allowed to pass, at least in NR, which bears every sign of being a carefully corrected text. In H, however, it has been corrected to 'the people of the year Eight Hundred and two thousand odd' (Chapter V).

There is another major difference between NY and the other texts in the chapter containing the 'kangaroo' episode in NR (XIII of NY and NR, XIV of H). Though the episode is not included in NY, the chapter is somewhat different from the corresponding one of H. The arrangement of several paragraphs at the opening corresponds with NR rather than H, and though it also incorporates what in NR is Chapter XIV and in H Chapter XV (the penultimate chapter of each), the part actually corresponding to Chapter XIV of H is shorter and less elaborately written: the following collation will show the kind of expansion introduced in NR-H.

NY

But as my motion became slower there was, I found, no blinking change of day and night. A steady twilight brooded over the earth. And the band of light that had indicated the sun had, I now noticed, become fainter, had faded indeed to invisibility in the east, and in the west was increasingly broader and

NR-H

As I drove on, a peculiar change crept over the appearance of things. The palpitating greyness grew darker; then—though I was still travelling with prodigious velocity—the blinking succession of day and night, which was usually indicative of a slower pace, returned, and grew more and more marked.

redder. The circling of the stars growing slower and slower had given place to creeping points of light. At last, some time before I stopped, the sun, red and very large, halted motionless upon the horizon, a vast dome glowing with a dull heat. The work of the tidal drag was accomplished. The earth had come to rest with one face to the sun even as in our own time the moon faces the earth.

This puzzled me very much at first. The alternations of night and day grew slower and slower, and so did the passage of the sun across the sky, until they seemed to stretch through centuries. At last a steady twilight brooded over the earth, a twilight only broken now and then when a comet glared across the darkling sky. The band of light that had indicated the sun had long since disappeared; for the sun had ceased to set—it simply rose and fell in the west, and grew ever broader and more red. All trace of the moon had vanished. The circling of the stars, growing slower and slower, had given place to creeping points of light. At last, some time before I stopped, the sun, red and very large, halted motionless upon the horizon, a vast dome glowing with a dull heat, and now and then suffering a momentary extinction. At one time it had for a little while glowed more brilliantly again, but it speedily reverted to its sullen red-heat. I perceived by this slowing down of its rising and setting that the work of the tidal drag was done. The earth had come to rest with one face to the sun, even as in our own time the moon faces the earth.

The third major difference between NY on the one hand, and NR and H on the other, comes at the very end of the book. In NR-H there is an eloquent 'Epilogue' of about 250 words which begins:

One cannot choose but wonder. Will he ever return? It may be that he swept back into the past, and fell among the blood-drinking, hairy savages of the Age of Unpolished Stone; into the abysses of the Cretaceous Sea; or among the grotesque saurians, the huge reptilian brutes of the Jurassic times.

It concludes:

And I have by me, for my comfort, two strange white flowers—shrivelled now, and brown and flat and brittle—to witness that even when mind and strength had gone, gratitude and a mutual tenderness still lived on in the heart of man.

In contrast to this highly coloured but dramatically effective conclusion,

the final sentences of NY merely offer a flat and abrupt return to the Kiplingesque manner of the opening pages:¹

Up to the present he has not returned, and when he does return he will find his home in the hands of strangers and his little gathering of auditors broken up for ever. Filby has exchanged poetry for playwriting, and is a rich man—as literary men go—and extremely unpopular. The Medical Man is dead, the Journalist is in India, and the Psychologist has succumbed to paralysis. Some of the other men I used to meet there have dropped completely out of existence as if they, too, had travelled off upon some similar anachronisms. And so, ending in a kind of dead wall, the story of the Time Machine must remain for the present at least.

Apart from these substantial additions to or omissions from the text, NY has a great many stylistic differences from NR and H, particularly in the latter two-thirds of the book. The possibility of editorial changes made by the New York publisher must be allowed for: there is evidence of such changes where spelling is concerned, since American spellings ('Traveler', 'clew', 'somber', 'color', &c.) have been consistently introduced, and 'damned' has been expurgated throughout to 'd——d'. In fact, the innumerable differences of punctuation, capitalization, and paragraphing may be mostly ascribed to Holt and Co. or their printer. NY has, in particular, many more paragraph divisions than H. But it seems less likely that the purely verbal alterations were made by the publisher, since in most cases their effect is to make NR-H seem less clumsy or more vivid, and precise than NY. The following collation of selected passages will make apparent the kind of stylistic differences in question.

NY

This again was a question I deliberately put to myself, and upon which my curiosity was at first entirely defeated. Neither were there any old or infirm among them.

(VII)

And finally the evident confusion in the sunlight, the hasty flight towards dark shadow, and the carriage of the head while in the light, re-enforced

H

This, again, was a question I deliberately put to myself, and my curiosity was at first entirely defeated upon the point. The thing puzzled me, and I was led to make a further remark, which puzzled me still more: that aged and infirm among this people there were none.

(VIII)

And last of all, that evident confusion in the sunshine, that hasty yet fumbling and awkward flight towards dark shadow, and that peculiar carriage of

¹ The influence of Kipling on some of Wells's short stories was remarked on in a review of *The Stolen Bacillus* in the *Saturday Review*, 21 December 1895.

the ide
retina.

[The n
denly'
in the
1894]

You ca
seating!
faces a
eyes se
evident
gained
when n
struck

I held
white t
visible

Someh
another

I walk
and av
trace of

A n
sent
early a
this as
what n
episod
April
would
The d
opinio
was al
same t
to kee

the idea of an extremely sensitive retina.

(VII)

[The next passage, substituting 'suddenly' for 'evidently', first appeared in the *National Observer*, 19 May 1894]

You can scarcely imagine how nauseatingly inhuman those pale chinless faces and great lidless, pinkish-gray eyes seemed, as they stared stupidly, evidently blinded by the light. So I gained time and retreated again, and when my second match had ended struck my third.

(VIII)

I held it flaring, and immediately the white backs of the Morlocks became visible as they fled amid the trees.

(XI)

Somehow this gave me strength for another effort.

(XI)

I walked about the hill among them and avoiding them, looking for some trace of Weena, but I found nothing.

(XI)

the head while in the light—all reinforced the theory of an extreme sensitiveness of the retina.

(VIII)

You can scarce imagine how nauseatingly inhuman they looked—those pale, chinless faces, and great, lidless, pinkish-grey eyes!—as they stared in their blindness and bewilderment. But I did not stay to look, I promise you: I retreated again, and when my second match had ended, I struck my third.

(IX)

I held it flaring, and saw the white backs of the Morlocks in flight amid the trees.

(XII)

It gave me strength.

(XII)

I walked about the hill among them and avoided them, looking for some trace of Weena. But Weena was gone.

(XII)

A number of conclusions may be drawn from the evidence so far presented. As I have implied, there is a very strong probability that NY is an early and unrevised version of NR-H. Apart from the stylistic differences this assumption is supported by the fact that Chapter XIII of NY somewhat resembles the corresponding chapter of NR but lacks the 'kangaroo' episode, which Wells presumably inserted at Henley's request in early April 1895. (And since NY was published early in May the manuscript would certainly have been with Holt before Wells made the addition.) The differences in the concluding paragraphs of the novel also support this opinion: in fact, it seems likely that the 'Epilogue', as published in NR-H, was also added by Wells, in response to Henley's letter of 1 April, at the same time as the 'kangaroo' episode, and that, unlike the latter, he decided to keep it when the novel was published as a book.

The evidence of the opening chapter is less conclusive, admittedly. But the probable sequence of events would appear to be as follows. Wells had originally intended to open the story with the introduction as printed in the *National Observer*, 17 March 1894, but being asked early in December 1894 for a new opening chapter he supplied one, and this was published in the *New Review* in January 1895. Wells kept the first 800 words of this new chapter for NY, but removed the rest, and added on instead the original *National Observer* article: hence the inconsistencies in the description of the 'Time Traveller'/'Philosophical Person' and the 'Provincial Mayor'/'Rector'. Before the publication of H, however, Wells removed all trace of the new first chapter he had written for NR, and merely kept the original *National Observer* opening, somewhat revised, with the inconsistencies that had appeared in NY removed. Chapter I of NY, therefore, appears to be an intermediate version between NR and H, though the rest of the text would appear to be earlier than NR. Unfortunately there is no surviving external evidence relating to NY: Wells does not refer to it in his autobiography, the records of Henry Holt and Co. do not go so far back, and there is apparently nothing bearing on the edition in the Wells papers at the University of Illinois. So any account of the history of NY must be conjecture based on internal evidence.

I think it probable that the text of NY is in fact the version that Wells developed from the *National Observer* articles in the summer and autumn of 1894, and that in December 1894 (or January 1895 at the latest) he was negotiating with Holt or an agent of theirs for an American edition of the book. There is a curious piece of evidence in Chapter XIV of NY, where we find the sentence, 'I heard the door of the laboratory slam, seated myself in a chair, and took up the *New Review*.' In NR-H 'a daily paper' is substituted for the name of the magazine. It is very likely that Wells inserted this little advertisement for Henley's new venture at about the time when Henley took over the editorship—i.e. in November or December 1894—but afterwards removed it as rather pointless. Before the manuscript was dispatched to America Wells rewrote the first chapter, adding part of the new opening he had written for NR. Thereafter it was out of his hands. It may also be significant that NY does not contain the dedication to Henley which appeared in H, and about which Wells and Henley were corresponding at the end of January 1895.

However, as the monthly parts appeared in the *New Review* Wells continued to revise the text, and the March, April, and May instalments were extensively rewritten, with the 'kangaroo' episode and the 'Epilogue' added to the May instalment. Finally, before the story was published as a book by Heinemann at the end of May, he made a few more verbal revisions, restored the opening chapter to something like his original

intention
kept th
edition,
his subs
Wells
he did t
first pul
In later
and in
than an
versions
and the
scrupul

intention of December 1894, and removed the 'kangaroo' episode but kept the 'Epilogue'. Wells may have virtually disowned the New York edition, since it represented an unrevised text, and this may account for his subsequent silence about it.

Wells was never again to bestow such care on revising his work, though he did make a number of changes to the text of *When the Sleeper Wakes*, first published in 1899, before it was reissued in 1910 as *The Sleeper Awakes*. In later years his writing became increasingly hurried and undistinguished, and in 1915 he wrote to Henry James, 'I had rather be called a journalist than an artist, that is the essence of it . . .'.¹ But a study of the successive versions that he made of *The Time Machine* between the summer of 1894 and the spring of 1895 suggests that the young Wells had an artistic scrupulosity almost rivalling that of James himself.

¹ James, *Letters* (London, 1920), ii. 505.

NOTES

OLD KENTISH WIG AND MIDDLE ENGLISH OWY

So far the evidence would appear to point conclusively to the south-west Midlands; but one feature points very strongly to the south-east. The excessively rare form *owy* . . . must be associated with OE *wig* for *weg*, several times attested in the *Late Kentish Glosses*. The localization of *owy* in ME is not known, but it is not likely to have occurred as far from Kent as the west Midlands. (A. J. Bliss, *Sir Orfeo* (Oxford, 1954), pp. xix-xx)

If OK. *wig* and ME. *owy* are connected, there is no doubt that this constitutes important evidence for the dialect and localization of many ME. texts. However, apart from the scarcity of occurrences, there are several notable discrepancies between the OK. and ME. examples which cast doubt on the dependability of this form as a dialect feature.

In OE. the form is restricted to three texts. The *Kentish Glosses* contain five examples (*wige* 207, 475, 812: *wig* 772: *wiferend* 137: beside *weogas* 21). It occurs once in the *Bede Glosses* (*ðorh wigas* 58). In the *Vespasian Psalter* there is also one example (*wig* glossing *viam* 36, 5), but in view of the numerous regular spellings (*weg*) this is probably a mistake; presumably the scribe was influenced by the *i* of *viam*, a common type of error in this text. The single example in the *Bede Glosses* is less easy to explain: in general these glosses show Mercian characteristics, and, apart from *wigas*, the only other sign of Kentish is the occurrence of *io* for *eo*. But it is possible that this is a composite gloss, with words collected from various sources in different dialects. If this is the case, it could be argued that *wig* was restricted to Kentish in OE., though the extreme rarity of the form makes certainty impossible. It is important that, whereas the simple word occurs seven times in OE. with this spelling, there are no examples of the *i* form in *onweg*/*āweg*.

In ME., on the other hand, the raised form is normally found in the compound. The following list of examples is not intended to be exhaustive, but to give some idea of the distribution. Apart from the doubtful form in *Lazamon*, all the examples noted occur in rhyme:

- (a) *Sir Orfeo* (Auchinleck MS.): *owy* 95, 491, 561, beside *ways/palays* 157.
- (b) *The XI Pains of Hell*: *owy/by* 159, beside *way/may* 53, *awey/day* 167.
- (c) *Sir Degarre*: *awai/maistri* 889.
- (d) *Lai le Freyne*: *owy/aspie* 301.
- (e) *Lazamon's Brut* (Cott. Caligula A ix only): *pat folc (hit) awi hald*.

This last example is obviously of little value, since it is not supported by rhyme; but it is interesting that, although a later scribe erased the previous word (*hit*), he left *awi* uncorrected.

In addition, there is a certain amount of important negative evidence in ME. For if the raised form was primarily a south-eastern feature, as is commonly supposed, one would expect it to appear in the *Ayenbite*; yet there are no examples either here or in the *Kentish Sermons*. Moreover, neither *The Owl and the Nightingale* nor *King Alisaunder* contains any examples, although they both show many Kentish features.

This evidence suggests the following conclusions:

- (i) In OE. the raised form is only found in the simple word.
- (ii) This is probably a Kentish feature, but since it only occurs seven times, certainty is impossible.
- (iii) In ME. the raised form is normally found in the compound word.
- (iv) It is never found in the group of MK. prose texts, nor in two of the poems most firmly established as south-eastern.
- (v) It is usually found in ME. together with the simple word in the normal form.

From the distribution of the ME. form it seems possible that it was caused by weak stress. The raising of vowels under weak stress is a common English phenomenon (cf. ModE. *ticket*; ME. *wumme* < *wā me*). It is notable that in *The XI Pains of Hell* *owy* and *awey* both occur supported by rhyme within eight lines of one another. It is unlikely that two separate forms of the word would have been maintained in spoken usage since the OE. period. I would therefore suggest that *owy* is a weak stress form, while *awey* shows the analogical re-introduction of the vowel of the simple word.

Whether or not this hypothesis is accepted, I hope I have shown the slender basis for the general assumption that ME. *owy* is to be connected with OK. *wig*. If, as I believe, there is no connexion between the OK. and ME. forms, obviously *owy* can no longer be considered so distinctive a dialect feature. This conclusion would necessitate a new approach to the problem of the localization of the texts in which *owy* appears. In particular, this form should not be cited as a reason for denying that the original dialect of *Sir Orfeo* was south-west Midland.

C. J. E. BALL

A PRINTED SOURCE FOR 'THE DEVONSHIRE MANUSCRIPT'

IN making a study of 'the Devonshire Manuscript' (Brit. Mus. Add. 17492), I have been aided by the work of Dr. Ethel Seaton printed in this journal (*R.E.S.*, N.S. vii (1956), 55-56). Dr. Seaton has pointed out that some of the verses in the Devonshire MS. formerly thought to be of early Tudor origin are actually copies of verses by Chaucer and his near contemporaries. In one instance, however, a slight inaccuracy in Dr. Seaton's list is of importance. The verses beginning 'Yff all the erthe were parchment scrybable' she describes as 'a variant, turned to praise of women, of st. 7 of the poem, "Loke wel aboute"', which can be found in Skeat's Oxford *Chaucer* (vii. 296). These verses, however, prove to be rather from 'The Remedy of Love', lines 239-45, which may be found in the Skeat facsimile of the 1532 Chaucer (p. 760). As Dr. Seaton observed of the other poems in the Devonshire MS., the copyist's interest was to turn all his borrowings to the praise of women. Thus, one line in the Devonshire MS., 'The faythfulnes yet and prayse of women', was originally 'The cursydnesse yet and disceyte of women' in Thynne's 1532 Chaucer.

The importance of relating these Devonshire verses to the Thynne Chaucer is in the completion of a group, all of which are in the manuscript and in the 1532 edition. When one considers the large number of manuscripts which would have been necessary to select the Devonshire verses, it seems likely that the copyist did not use manuscripts at all. Rather, he was probably borrowing from the printed text of the 1532 Chaucer. This gives us a *terminus a quo* for a number of folios in the Devonshire MS.

Further investigation may also yield an *ad quem* for the greater part of the Manuscript. The verses signed 'T. H.' concluding on 46^r seem to me to be in the same hand as those on 92, which are actually from Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*. I have not seen a specimen of the hand of Lord Thomas Howard, who is probably the 'T. H.' of f. 46^r. If the hand of Lord Thomas proves to be that of both ff. 46 and 92, we may have a good basis for dating all the intervening material between 1532 and 1537, in which year Lord Thomas died in the Tower. The conclusion, however, would depend on a closer physical examination of the Devonshire volume than I have as yet made. The general soundness of the hypothesis is suggested by the fact that none of Wyatt's lyrics which can be definitely placed after 1537 is included in the Devonshire MS. A more extensive study of the position the Devonshire poems have in the Wyatt canon will be forthcoming in a study of Wyatt's poems I have just completed.

RICHARD C. HARRIER

*TITYRE-TU AND THE DATE OF WILLIAM
ROWLEY'S WOMAN NEVER VEXT*

WILLIAM ROWLEY's play *A New Wonder, A Woman Never Vext* was printed in 1632. It has been variously dated hitherto, on the mistaken assumption that there is no internal clue to the date of its composition. Yet it contains an allusion which could hardly have been made at all before December 1623, and would probably have held no meaning for audiences in general before January 1624.

At the end of Act II, the 'clown' Hodge, disappointed in his hopes of eventually marrying the Widow 'never vext', bursts out: 'Have I stood all this while to my mistress an honest, handsome, plain-dealing serving-creature, and she to marry a whoreson *tityre tu tattere* with never a good rag about him?'¹ The point of Hodge's *tityre tu tattere* is explained by a passage in one of John Chamberlain's letters to Carleton. Writing on 6 Dec. 1623, he reported:

There is a crew or knot of such kind of people ['our papists'] discovered who under colour of goode fellowship have made an association and taken certain oaths and orders devised among themselves, specially to be true and faithfull to the societie and to conceale one anothers secrets, but mixed with a number of other ridiculous toyes to disguise the matter, as having a Prince whom they call Ottoman, wearing of blew or yellow ribans in their hatts or elsewhere, having certain nicknames (as Titere-tu and such like) for their severall fraternities with many other odd conceits the botome whereof is not yet discovered, though divers of them have ben examined and some committed (as one of the Windsors and a few others). Most of them are young gentlemen who use to flocke to taverns thirty and forty in a companie. This combination began first in the Low Countries in the Lord Vaulx his regiment, and hath since spread yt self here to the number of eight score alreedy knowne. What mischeife may lurke under this maske God knowes, but sure they were very confident and presumed much of themselves to carrie yt so openly.²

Chamberlain's is apparently the earliest known allusion to the *tityre-tus*. At the date of his letter that fraternity may have existed, at any rate in England, for no more than a few months. Since Lord Vaux of Harrowden obtained permission to recruit his regiment only in April 1622,³ the *tityre-tu* association must have been transplanted to England when some of the regiment returned on leave at the end of the campaigning season, in autumn, in either 1622 or 1623. We may exclude the earlier year on the strength of Chamberlain's report, which shows that information about the *tityre-tu* fraternities became public only late in 1623.

¹ *Dodsley's Old English Plays*, ed. W. C. Hazlitt (1876), xii. 134.

² *Letters of John Chamberlain*, ed. N. E. McClure (Philadelphia, 1939), ii. 530.

³ S. R. Gardiner, *History of England, 1603-42* (1883), iv. 305.

At first, as is clear from Chamberlain's comments, the *tityre-tus* were regarded primarily as factious or rebellious. Another early allusion (not noticed in *O.E.D.*) appears to have a similar significance: in Ben Jonson's masque *The Fortunate Isles*, 306-8, the poet Skelton is termed

The worshipfull *Poet Laureat* to *K. Harry*,
And *Tityre tu* of those times.

The Fortunate Isles was finished just before 29 Dec. 1624.¹ Jonson's use of *Tityre-tu* suggests that even as late as the end of 1624 the term was not yet synonymous with 'roaring boy', though later it undoubtedly became so, as *O.E.D.* shows. However, it cannot have been long before it came to signify a roisterer or daredevil, for that is the meaning it bears in Rowley's *A Woman Never Vext*.

Since Rowley died in February 1626,² *A Woman Never Vext* must have been written by the end of 1625 or, at latest, January 1626. If that play, and in particular Hodge's soliloquy at the end of Act II, was not altered after it was first produced (and there is not the slightest indication of such alteration) it cannot be dated earlier than 1624. Quite possibly it was written later, when the phrase *tityre-tu* had developed more of the meaning it retained for the rest of the century. Thus the extreme limits of date for *A Woman Never Vext* are January 1624 and January 1626. On the available evidence it seems slightly more probable that it was written in 1625 than in 1624.

I. A. SHAPIRO

COMUS, ONCE MORE, 1761

WE have previously pointed out (*T.L.S.*, 17 September 1954, p. 591) that in an essay in *The Gentleman's Magazine* (February 1741) some lines contrasting love and lust were not from Milton's *Comus* (the source alleged) but from Dalton's stage version of this masque. Dalton's version was first published in 1738. We have recently come across some additional evidence of the continued use of it.

In Samuel Derrick's *A Poetical Dictionary; or, The Beauties of the English Poets* (1761) a number of passages attributed to Milton's *Comus* are in fact from Dalton's adaptation. For example the subject 'Dancing' is illustrated by the following lines, which are said to be from 'Milton's *Comus*':

Now softly slow let Lydian measures move,
And breath the pleasing pangs of gentle love.
In swimming dance on airs soft billows float,
Soft heave your bosoms with the swelling note:

¹ Herford and Simpson, *Ben Jonson*, vii. 703.

² C. J. Sisson, *Lost Plays of Shakespeare's Age* (Cambridge, 1936), p. 102.

With pliant arm in graceful motion vie,
 Now sunk with ease, with ease now lifted high;
 Till lively gesture each fond care reveal,
 That musick can express, or passion feel.

Anyone who is familiar with Milton's masque will, of course, instantly realize that these lines are spurious in thought and style. They occur in Dalton's version at the point where Comus, waving his wand, brings on his 'sedge-crown'd Naiades', who introduce a 'slow dance expressive of the passion of Love'. In Dalton's version, which was designed to 'prevent a coldness and languor in the audience', the dance is followed by two ballads: one by the Pastoral Nymph lamenting Damon, her faithless swain; the other by a quite un-Miltonic Euphrosyne, who believes that love is the greatest bliss below and whose ballad is a strange compound of eroticism and cynicism.

In Derrick's *Poetical Dictionary* Dalton's adaptation is the real source of a number of quotations that are attributed to Milton's *Comus*. For example, under the heading 'Enchantment', a long passage from the Attendant Spirit's account of Comus and his victims includes three lines from Dalton, which are here italicized:

He ripe and frolic of his full grown age,
 Roving the Celtic and Iberian fields,
 At last betakes him to this ominous wood,
 And in thick shelter of black shades imbower'd,
 Excels his mother at her mighty art,
 Off'ring to ev'ry weary traveller
 His orient liquor in a Chrystal glass,
 To quench the drought of Phoebus; which as they taste,
 (For most do taste thro' fond intemp'rate thirst)
 Soon as the potion works, their human countenance,
 Th' express resemblance of the Gods, is chang'd
 Into some brutish form of wolf or bear,
 Or ounce, or tyger, hog, or bearded goat,
 All other parts remaining as they were.
*Yet when he walks his tempting rounds, the sorcerer
 By magic power their human face restores,
 And outward beauty to delude the sight.*

... They so perfect is their misery,
 Not once perceive this foul disfigurement,
 But boast themselves more comely than before,
 And all their friends and native home forget,
 To roll with pleasure in a sensual sty. (i. 267)

These lines were introduced so that Comus's crew would conform to the

state described in a preceding stage direction: Comus enters and 'with him a rout of Men and Women dressed as Bacchanals . . .'. Obviously Dalton did not wish to have on the stage a 'rout of Monsters headed like sundry sorts of Wilde Beasts, . . .'.

Of the same sort, under the heading 'Magician', are the following lines, spoken by the Elder Brother after his sister is released by Sabrina:

I oft had heard but ne'er believ'd till now,
There are, who can by potent magic spells
Bend to their crooked purpose nature's laws,
Blot the fair moon from her resplended orb,
Bid whirling planets stop their destin'd course,
And thro' the yawning earth from Stygian gloom
Call up the meagre ghost to walks of light. (iii. 92)

These feeble lines, so palpably spurious, are by the same hand as the following, under the heading 'Love':

Love, like Od'rous Zephyr's grateful breath
Repayes the flow'r that sweetness which it borrow'd;
Uninjuring, uninjur'd, lovers move
In their own sphere of happiness confest
By mutual faith avoiding mutual blame. (iii. 45)

And these, under the heading 'Lust':

Capricious, wanton, bold, and brutal lust,
Is mean and selfish; when resisted, cruel;
And, like the blast of pestilential winds,
Taints the sweet bloom of nature's fairest forms. (iii. 76)

And, later, these:

Short is the course of ev'ry lawless pleasure;
Grief, like a shade, on all its footsteps waits,
Scarce visible in joy's meridian height;
But downward as its blaze declining speeds,
The dwarfish shadow to a giant spreads. (iii. 77)

The last lines were spoken by the Younger Brother, who in Dalton is like his brother a philosopher. Under 'Lust' the *Poetical Dictionary* cites also the following lines, spoken in Dalton by the Elder Brother after the Fair Women go out, leaving to 'these pedant youth their bookish dreams':

May scorn pursue her wanton arts,
And all the painted charms that vice can wear;
Yet oft o'er credulous youth such Syrens triumph,
And lead their captive sense in chains as strong
As links of Adamant. (iii. 77)

All these passages are attributed to 'Milton's *Comus*' as the source. Obviously there was in Derrick's mind no distinction between Dalton's masque and Milton's.

A number of other passages, cited to illustrate such subjects as comfort in solitude, contemplation, courtesy, deceit, echo, harmony, night, correspond with the true reading of Milton's *Comus*, which in these cases Dalton followed.

Although it has nothing to do with *Comus*, the following example is worth noting as evidence of Derrick's carelessness. After quoting as an illustration of Melancholy the first ten lines of *L' Allegro*, Derrick quotes another passage of nineteen lines. It begins:

Hence all you vain delights,
As short as are the nights,
Wherein you spend your folly;
There's nought in this life sweet,
If man were wise to see it,
But only melancholy.

And it ends with these lines:

Then stretch our bones in a still gloomy valley,
Nothing's so dainty sweet as lovely melancholy.

This entire passage Derrick attributed to Milton's *Il Penseroso*. It is, of course, from William Strode's *Melancholy*.

Under the heading 'Spheres' Derrick quotes the following lines:

There's not the smallest orb which thou behold'st,
But in his motion like an angel sings,
Still quiring to the young ey'd cherubims.
Such harmony is in immortal sounds!
But whilst this muddy vesture of decay
Doth grosly close us in, we cannot hear it.

Derrick assigns this passage from *The Merchant of Venice* (v. i. 60-65) to Milton.

Dalton's version of *Comus* seems to have been popular. The dates of its publication in the eighteenth century are 1738, 1741, 1750, 1759, 1760, 1762, 1777, and 1797. On the other hand, Milton's masque was published separately only twice, in 1747 and 1798. In 1799 it appeared with *L' Allegro* and *Il Penseroso*, and it was included in Warton's edition of the *Minor Poems*, in 1785 and 1791. *Comus* also appeared in the editions of *Paradise Regained* and the *Occasional Poems*, in 1713, 1743, 1747, 1752, 1753, 1756, 1772, and 1773, not to mention the various editions of the complete *Poetical Works*.

Derrick also included in his *Poetical Dictionary* many extracts from the major poems, especially from *Paradise Lost*. For example, excerpts from the epic make up most of pages 2 and 3 and all of pages 10 to 13.

This, then, is the question: why did Derrick use Dalton's version of *Comus*, especially when he quoted accurately from Milton's other poems? One may only conjecture that he chose Dalton's stage version because he considered it superior to Milton's masque or, on the other hand, because he considered it identical with Milton's. To be just, however, we must remember that the prologue to the stage version apologized for the 'meaner phrase' which, it is said, clogged Milton's 'nobler lays' and contrasted his 'pure essence' with 'the grosser mean | Thro' which his spirit is in action seen'. Obviously Derrick was not conscious of this distinction. This matter, especially as an illustration of the poetic taste of the eighteenth century, seems to invite further study.

ANN GOSSMAN
GEORGE W. WHITING

Cynew
Old
Stud
in hav
in Me
Miss C
materi
achiev
Spa
Miss
that th
unpub
value
quoted
l. 937

the n
mean
streng
for S
readi
Th
Grad
centu
indee
is sai
scrip
Te
The
over
with
line
I
parag
n. to
'-'
span
l. 87
for

REVIEWS

Cynewulf's Elene. Edited by P. O. E. GRADON. Pp. x+114 (Methuen's Old English Library). London: Methuen, 1958. 12s. 6d. net.

Students of Old English, both undergraduates and specialists, are fortunate in having some of the best-known shorter Anglo-Saxon texts admirably edited in Methuen's Old English Library series. As *Elene* is a long text for this series, Miss Gradon has had to cut her apparatus to 'a minimum of new and essential material'; and specialists, to whom the edition is addressed, will appreciate her achievement in packing so much information into the limited space available.

Space has not been found for the Latin source; which is regrettable because Miss Gradon, in a very full investigation of the sources, concludes (pp. 18 f.) that the manuscript which best represents the Latin text Cynewulf used is the unpublished eighth-century St. Gall MS. 225. It would have been of great value to print this. Oddly enough, it is not used in the notes, where the Latin quoted is from Holthausen's composite text, which has no authority. Thus at l. 937, in the passage

... —him wæs Halig Gast
befolen fæste, fyrhat lufu,
weallende gewitt þurh wigan snyttro—
7 þæt word gecwæð . . .

the manuscript reading *wigan* is defended in the conjectural and unlikely meaning 'Holy One', while the traditional emendation *witgan* is rejected, on the strength of the Latin 'Iudas autem fervens in SS., dixit' ('SS' apparently stands for *Spiritu Sancto*). But we are not told that the St. Gall MS. lacks *Sancto*, reading 'feruens in spiritu, dixit', and so lends no support to *wigan* 'Holy One'.

The Introduction includes a description of the manuscript, which Miss Gradon has examined afresh; and an account of its history (the nineteenth-century part of this is interesting). A section on the language is, inevitably, indecisive; and some details relied on are doubtful: e.g. confusion of *ð* and *d* is said to be Mercian (p. 12), but this is a commonplace of Anglo-Saxon manuscripts.

Text and notes are careful, and accurate apart from some obvious misprints.¹ The text is misleadingly set out at l. 893. Here the scribe, finding that he would overrun the last line of section X of *Elene* by one word (*gesceafta*), copied it, with a bracket to show where it belonged, at the right-hand end of the blank line below, so as to leave the left side clear for the capital beginning the next

¹ The misprints I have noticed are listed, for correction in a second edition; p. 15, last paragraph, 'March' for 'May'; p. 24, l. 7 *sēs* for *sēs*; p. 36, l. 246 *pigan* for *Wigan*; p. 37, n. to 252, 'ship' for 'ships'; p. 42, l. 417 *3a* for *Pa*, l. 418 *Pidda* for *yidda*; p. 47, l. 546 '—' for '7'; p. 48, l. 585 *endelifes*—; p. 49, l. 610 [*cyning*] for *cyning*, cf. l. 1041; p. 50 n. *spamode* for *spamode*; p. 53, n. to 724a *ncyðan* for *oncyðan*; p. 55, l. 769 *Wær* for *Pær*; p. 59, l. 874 *Wa* for *Pa*; p. 61, n. to 937b, *pitga* for *pitgan*; n. to 960, *spa* (twice) for *spa*, *chicne* for *epicne*; p. 68, l. 1146 '7' for '7'. (I print *W* in default of capital *wynn*.)

section: *gesceafta* is printed in a line to itself, as in the manuscript, but without explanation, and without the bracket that showed the scribe's intention. The most disconcerting feature of the text is the editorial punctuation, which I do not understand. Examples are:

saga gif ðu cunne
on hwylcre pyssa þreora þeoden engla,
geþrowode, þrymmes hyrde. (856 ff.)

Ic eow to soðe secgan wille
7 þæs in life lige ne wyrðeð
gif ge þissum lease leng gefylgað,
mid fæcne gefice, þe me fore standap
þæt eow in beorge bæl fornimeð,
hattost heaðowelma 7 eower hra bryttað,
lacende lig þæt eow sceal þæt leas áþundrad
weorðan to woruldgedale. (574 ff.)

The text is generally conservative, though the editor has suggestions for most of the desperate places. Rarely, a hard passage is passed over without comment (e.g. ll. 581-3, and *oft* in 920). More often the reader is left to sift too many conflicting views, of which the essentials are not stated; and he will wish that Miss Gradon had given her own judgement. For instance, the note to l. 1257b, on the *c*-rune, begins with the usual interpretation *cen* 'torch', and then goes on:

The interpretation *cyn* (Trautmann, BB i. 70) and also *cene* (Kemble *Archæologia* xxviii, 363) have been supported by reference to *Crist* 797, but although the partial spellings in Riddle 65 might be compared it is more probable that in *Crist* the first three runes together spell *cyn* 'mankind'. Cp. Riddle 20. But some support for the interpretation *cene* might be seen in the spelling *cæn*¹ in St John's College 17 and in the Welsh gloss *guichr*² 'anger', 'impetuous' in MS Bodley Auct. F. 4. 32 (cp. Derolez p. 159). Or *cen* might have been taken to equal *cyn* as *wen* equals *wyn*.

Generally the glossary is accurate and helpful. Occasionally an extra gloss (or a note) might be added: e.g. to *duguð(um)* 1092, &c., *georne* 1162, &c., *hús* 880, *gesceaft* 1088, *wælrūn* 28, *wic* 1143; the gloss 'now present' to *andweardlice* adv. 1140 is probably a slip.

In reviewing an edition of a much-edited text like *Elene*, it is impossible to avoid giving criticisms an undeserved prominence. Much research has gone into this edition; and scholars will welcome it for its survey of modern work on the text, for its extensive and up-to-date references in notes and bibliography, and for the new matter in the Introduction.

CELIA SISAM

¹ Misprinted for *coen* (?).

² The name *guichr* is given to the *g*-rune in this ninth-century Welsh runic alphabet; the *c*-rune is named *cúsil*.

The Peterborough Chronicle 1070-1154. Edited by CECILY CLARK. Pp. lxx+120 (Oxford English Monographs). Oxford: University Press, 1958. 30s. net.

This book is an edition of the annals 1070-1154 in the Laud manuscript of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle. It thus cuts across palaeographical and historical boundaries but has a peculiar value for the philologist since it gives a manageable section of the earlier part of the Chronicle to contrast with the first continuation (1122-31), of which the linguistic significance is fully discussed in the Introduction. The Peterborough Interpolations are printed as an appendix. The book will perhaps be of primary interest to philologists, but Miss Clark justly claims that the historical interest of these significant annals has not been neglected. Thus the Preface contains sections dealing not only with palaeographical, literary, and philological matters but also with the relationship of these annals to the Latin chronicles and with their historical value. The text incorporates some corrections to Earle and Plummer, but these are of a fairly trivial kind: sometimes mere spelling variants, sometimes forms which are significant to the philologist rather than to the historian; for example, 1075/4 *on Norðfolc*] EP *on Norðfolc*; 1075/34 *of lande*] EP *of land*; 1087/33 *eall*] EP *ealle*; 1092/5 *wifan*] EP *wifa*; 1113/1 *geare*] EP *gear*; 1120/2 *ealle*] EP *ealles*. It is unfortunate that printing costs necessitated the omission of bibliography and glossary, especially as the text is likely to be used by undergraduates. The enforced shortness of the book also means that constant reference must be made to Miss Clark's articles in *Medium Ævum*, *English and Germanic Studies*, the appendix to the facsimile of *The Peterborough Chronicle*, and *English Studies*. In these much new and interesting material is to be found which it was not possible to include in this volume and which thus does not come within the purview of this notice.

The most valuable part of the Introduction is perhaps the sections discussing the dialectal and chronological aspects of the language. Miss Clark's investigations lead her to agree substantially with writers such as Behm in assuming that the dialect of the Peterborough sections is basically Anglian although certainly influenced by the *Schriftsprache*. She properly doubts the supposed Kentish affinities seen by Bachmann in the copied annals. Her careful and interesting analysis of morphology and syntax confirms that the Peterborough annals (including, of course, the Peterborough Interpolations) are 'the earliest authentic example of that East-Midland language which was to be the chief ancestor of our modern Standard English' (p. lvi). A few points of detail merit comment. In the absence of a science of 'graphemics' Miss Clark is wisely cautious as to the significance of the *æ* spellings for both long and short vowels in the later part of the text. She is no doubt correct in seeing both phonetic change (giving rise to back spellings) and phonetic environment, and even perhaps race mixture, as partly responsible for the problematical spellings. But it may be that purely graphic confusion plays a considerable part. Miss Clark herself draws attention to the evidence brought forward by von Feilitzen (*The Pre-Conquest Personal Names of Domesday Book*) for French spellings in Domesday Book in which

the representation of OE. [æ] wavers between *e* and *a*. If von Feilitzen is correct in supposing that the evidence was mainly oral, then we presumably have proximate spelling based on some kind of sound substitution; and this kind of process may have played some part in the early Middle English use of the graphs *æ*, *e*, *a*. But it may also be noted that some early Anglo-Norman texts use the OE. ligature for *e* of various types. Thus the *Canterbury Psalter* 23/3 *estærad* (*stabit*) MS. B (B.N. 8846) *esterat*; 30/12 *fuæzient* (*fugiebant*) B *fueient*; 34/2 *en la mæie aie* (*in auxilium meum*) B *meie*; 38/14 *pærre* (*patres*) B *pere*; 40/2 *terræ* (*terra*) B *terre*; 74/4 *læ* B *le*; the Arundel Psalter (probably a Crowland book, although it has been thought that it might have come from Peterborough) 29/8 *a la meie bæaltet* (*decori meo*); 33/14 *pæis* (*pacem*); 65/5 *la mære* (*mare*) (cf. E. Burghardt, *Über den Einfluss des Englischen auf das Anglonormannische* (Halle, 1906)). These spellings seem to suggest that we may in some cases have a purely graphic confusion whereby *e* is mechanically substituted for *æ* and vice versa; on the other hand, where an attempt was made to spell correctly, *æ* with its 'French' value *e* would not be appropriate for WG.[a] whether it represented [æ], [a], or [ɑ]. But it could be conveniently represented by *a*, which in French was used for both [ɑ] and the more common [a].

In the second place, it seems doubtful whether the loss of the dative inflexion in *a*-stems is usefully explained by analogy with other declensions which in OE. have identical forms in the accusative and dative. Miss Clark herself admits that this view is difficult to sustain since the loss of dative inflexion occurs most readily in the North and Midlands, where these very declensions which are supposed to have provided the analogy are least in evidence. Surely we have rather a case of what Wilhelm Horn (*Sprachkörper und Sprachfunktion*) has called 'Übercharakterisierung', since the existence already in OE. of a number of declensions in which dative and accusative were indistinguishable as the result of phonetic change suggests that some other linguistic mechanism such as word-order or the use of prepositions had already taken the place of the dative function of the inflexion. The post-prepositional case in the *a*-declension and the analogical feminines might be thought to witness against this view, but it seems to offer fewer difficulties than that to which Miss Clark gives hesitant approval. Thirdly, in regard to Miss Clark's theory of 'masculinization' it may be tentatively suggested that this could be partly associated with the splitting up of the OE. article-demonstrative with its strongly demonstrative and anaphoric sense into a demonstrative *þat* (pl. *þa*) and the definite article *þe* (*þa*). This would possibly lead to the avoidance of the neuter forms even where gender concord required it (especially where grammatical gender was already weak as is demonstrably the case here) if the sense was not demonstrative or emphatic.

The annotation is generally admirably clear and succinct. It is a pity that the historical commentary had to be so drastically reduced, even though the glossary of proper names and the short bibliography of secondary sources helps to mitigate this. In some cases the notes appear over-compressed. The note on 1070/27 might serve as an example. The crown and footstool presumably refer to the *nimbus* (cf. Latin *corona* = 'nimbus') and *suppedaneum* which, as Reil has pointed out, frequently appear with early crucifixes (*Die frühchristlichen*

Darstel
are am
is thus
likely
emphas
sufficie
stand f
in a tec
tive Pro
the ph
probab
by O.I.
would
has the
this tex
writers
odditie
(1091/4
looks li
p. 173)
Then
This is
who, li
it origi
they w

Medie
SPEI

Mr.
Middle
treatme
The
'conter
as in so
definini
he drav
thirteen
which
person
what is
again h
stir in
Thu
4690.

Darstellungen der Kreuzigung Christi (Leipzig, 1904)). Anglo-Saxon examples are amply illustrated in, for example, Talbot Rice's *English Art 871-1100*. There is thus nothing surprising in their appearance here, although it is, of course, likely that their use was due, as Miss Clark suggests, to the early Church's emphasis on Christ's victory on the cross rather than His suffering. A reader sufficiently naïve to be surprised at their appearance would perhaps not understand from the note that the words 'crown' and 'footstool' were being used in a technical sense. At 1087/59 a reference to Karlberg, *The English Interrogative Pronouns* (Stockholm, 1954), might have been made. As Karlberg points out, the phrase looks as though it might have been influenced by Fr. *confait*, but probably the OHG. analogy cited by Miss Clark and the MDu. use of *doen* cited by O.E.D. must be accepted as evidence of Germanic origin. Few people would now subscribe to Howorth's view that 'the language of the compiler has the marks of being a Frenchman's English', but perhaps the Englishness of this text can also be exaggerated. Certainly, in spite of the agnosticism of writers such as Trampe Bødtker, one cannot help suspecting that some of its oddities may be gallicisms. For example, the phrase *heora sehte togædere eode* (1091/4-5) oddly suggests Fr. *convenir* 'to come to pass', and the spelling *halechen* looks like a French spelling confusion (cf. Waters, *St. Brendan* (Oxford, 1928), p. 173).

There are inevitably a few printer's errors, but the work is accurate as a whole. This is undoubtedly a useful edition of *The Peterborough Chronicle*. If readers who, like the reviewer, have had the privilege of consulting the thesis in which it originated will regret that so much of interest had necessarily to be omitted, they will also be impressed by how much has been included.

PAMELA GRADON

Medieval English Poetry. The Non-Chaucerian Tradition. By JOHN SPEIRS. Pp. 406. London: Faber and Faber, 1957. 42s. net.

Mr. Speirs has written an odd, inconsistent, and disjointed book on a subject, Middle English poetry apart from Chaucer, of which consistent and coherent treatment would be welcome indeed.

The period which he sets out to cover is a little uncertain. He speaks of 'contemporaries and near-contemporaries' of Chaucer, and he sees these poets as in some sense forming a tradition, or even school, for he speaks of 'the task of defining the characteristics of non-Chaucerian poetry as a whole' (p. 14). Yet he draws on only a small selection of poems, from a selection of kinds, from the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. These are arranged in an order which Mr. Speirs carefully explains owes nothing to chronology, but is purely personal (p. 39). His selection, too, is not governed by any consideration of what is important within its period, or has generally been accepted as good, but again by a purely personal interest (pp. 37-38), which may sometimes seem to stir in a curiously capricious way.

Thus Mr. Speirs has a chapter on a selection of 'Carols and other Songs and

Lyrics', which seem to him to qualify as 'the indigenous song verse type' (p. 45). The phrase is quoted from the introduction of R. H. Robbins, *Secular Lyrics of the XIVth and XVth Centuries* (Oxford, 2nd edn. 1955). He follows this with a chapter describing some non-alliterative romances, including four Breton Lays. Chapter IV is called 'Alliterative Romances and Poems', but *Sir Gawayne and the Grene Knight* and the first episode of *The Awntyrs of Arthure* are the only representatives of romance, while *Wynner and Wastoure* and *The Parliament of the Three Ages* are the only poems not romances. Some of the *Towneley Plays* are then discussed in a chapter headed 'The Mystery Cycle', and finally there is an attempt to relate the literature and the painting and sculpture of medieval England.

The reader can hardly help asking why this small and apparently random selection of texts—a selection which finds no place, for example, for *The Owl and the Nightingale*, for the alliterative *Morte Arthure*, for *Pearl*, or for *Piers Plowman*—should be regarded as essentially representative of what is 'non-Chaucerian' in medieval English literature; and indeed, he might also ask why (except that Mr. Speirs has already written a book on Chaucer) the label 'non-Chaucerian' should have been used at all. It does, however, emerge that in planning his book Mr. Speirs was influenced by certain ruling ideas, which must be taken into account if the value of his work is to be fairly estimated.

One such idea, which appears early in his introduction, is a profound distrust of professional medieval studies. 'This book', he tells us, 'was therefore partly, or at least incidentally, conceived as a deliberate attempt (perhaps quixotic) to lift medieval English poetry out from the professional "Middle English" specialism' (p. 17). Elsewhere he describes the enemy with loving care: 'The word Medievalist has acquired, not without some reason, a limiting suggestion as indicating one who is not *widely* read and, partly as a consequence, one whose judgement in literature would be likely to be naïve and unreliable, one who would not be able to know which are the best poems, and one who is remote from modern literature—and from life' (p. 15). No one would, perhaps, grudge Mr. Speirs his fun with the stock figure of the Pedant, or have anything but praise for his hatred of what we might sum up as 'gobbetry'. But when we come to the critical judgements which he clearly considers the essential part of his book we may begin to wonder whether his rejection of conventional scholarship and his reliance on 'the best contemporary standards, and no others' (p. 16), however promisingly defined, can lead to real understanding.

An instance of the dangers of the method is provided by his explanation of his reasons for leaving out *Pearl*: 'It seems to me that this fine poem, being *more personal or private* [my italics], does not quite belong with the traditional poetry and that it therefore requires separate treatment' (p. 37). It is easy to see how an approach from the standards of the present day (a footnote gives Mr. Eliot's *Marina* as a significant parallel), should lead Mr. Speirs to this conclusion. It is not so easy to see how it could lead him to a fruitful criticism of *Pearl*.

His chapter on *Sir Gawayne and the Grene Knight* begins bravely enough: '*Sir Gawayne* . . . is a great English poem', and he is severe in his comments on what he calls 'the edition at present used by students', for 'the introduction

and le
edition
again
between
itself t
difficul
exagger
avoid
struggl
yep 'ea
someti
indicat

Who
justify
we are
pages
mediev
fully h
[i.e. to
French
We mi
the an
existed

Ant
pointin
is little
ing, an
will st
annota
him no
other i

Wh
poems
with a

Piers
Pp.
Pres

Prof
plan a
finally,
elucida
in the

and lengthy, mostly irrelevant notes, which further overlay the poem in this edition (as in most other editions of so-called Middle English texts), illustrate again the depressing technique of interposing extrinsic "points of interest" between the reader and the poem, and so distracting attention from the poem itself to these; as if the significance of a great poem were not in itself the most difficult thing in the world to grasp, without the deliberate obtrusion and exaggeration of external difficulties' (pp. 215-16). This means that, in order to avoid the viciousness of close textual study, Mr. Speirs's readers are left to struggle with a text sometimes inaccurately glossed (p. 223 *hap* 'happiness', *yep* 'eager'; p. 226 *That al the rous renes* of 'that all the fame is about that spreads'); sometimes not glossed at all (p. 226 *wayued his berde*); and never provided with any indication that there is difficulty in establishing the exact nuance of a phrase.

When it comes to the actual criticism of the poem, the criticism which is to justify its continued existence by attracting to it a living, contemporary audience, we are first struck by the fact that Mr. Speirs has a 'gobbetry' of his own. His pages are full of references to anthropology—to the survival in the poetry of medieval England of ancient ritual and initiation ceremony. He finds it delightfully humorous that 'one of the curiosities of Tolkien and Gordon's introduction [i.e. to their edition] is a diagram in which the letters of the alphabet represent French originals that do not exist but are assumed to have existed' (p. 217 n. 2). We might, in turn, be tempted to remark that a curiosity of Mr. Speirs's book is the anthropological parallels which do not exist but which he assumes to have existed.

Anthropology is a poor substitute for criticism, but apart from some enthusiastic pointing out of beauties in the description or construction of *Sir Gawayne* there is little that could add to our understanding of the poem. The rest is summarizing, and one is tempted to think that the would-be reader of *Sir Gawayne* will still need to find his own approach through the 'irrelevancies' of a well-annotated and glossed edition. To this, however, Mr. Speirs is careful to give him no signpost. In all the book there is no quotation with any line reference or other indication that it can be found in any other printed book.

What is true of the chapter on *Sir Gawayne* is true of the treatment of other poems; it is disappointing, after an offer of critical cake, to be presented merely with a particularly gritty anthropological stone.

P. M. KEAN

Piers Plowman and the Scheme of Salvation. By ROBERT WORTH FRANK, JR.
Pp. xiv+124 (Yale Studies in English 136). New Haven: Yale University Press, 1957; London: Oxford University Press, 1958. 32s. net.

Professor Frank makes clear at the beginning of his work that to him 'a plan and a concern for organization are . . . apparent and do shape the poem, finally, into a unified whole' (pp. 4-5); his book is chiefly concerned with an elucidation of this plan by an analysis in order of the three divisions of the *Vita* in the B-text. In a long preliminary chapter, where he outlines his conception

of the unifying factors of the *Vita*, he sets his view in the perspective of the body of criticism and interpretation of the poem which has appeared in articles and essays during the past thirty years, and seeks to demonstrate its originality. He finds that Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest 'do not possess individual meanings but are divisions of the generic term "Dowel", and that when using them the poet had always a simple, all-inclusive concept in mind, not three separate concepts or ways of life' (p. 12). This view he sharply contrasts with 'a composite interpretation' which he constructs from the studies of Professor Wells, Professor Coghill, and the late R. W. Chambers, and which explains the three terms as three ways of life, Active, Contemplative, and Mixed. Here, and in other parts of the book where he returns to a criticism of the 'Wells-Coghill-Chambers' view, one is often conscious both of special pleading and serious misunderstanding of the opinions of these scholars. Mr. Frank chooses to believe that their several interpretations have more in common than in fact they have, that their concepts of Dowel, Dobet, and Dobest are rigidly univocal, and that they are more widely different from his own than seems to be the case.

It has surely been established by now that there is nothing new or startling about the religious ideas put forward by Langland in his poem: they may all be found in the vernacular manuals of instruction and in the many Latin encyclopaedic works of the fourteenth century. *Piers Plowman* can be regarded as a rhetorical work in which the function of *inventio* has been to achieve an objective correlative, or series of them; after that, *dispositio*, *amplificatio*, *elocutio* have been the poet's main interest, in relation to his burning concern with Society, or, as he would have conceived it, the Church. Mr. Frank is not concerned with those aspects of *Piers Plowman*, but with the framework of ideas. His occasionally uneasy handling of these ideas and his frequent unawareness of their wider implications (which Langland often takes for granted) constantly limit the validity and usefulness of his analysis of the three parts of the *Vita* and his brief account of its relation to the *Visio*. To cite some examples: he clearly misunderstands the doctrine of indulgences when discussing the Pardon of Passus vii (and represents the present reviewer—on p. 30, n. 8—as having tried to establish that the Priest accepts the Pardon, when his intention was quite the contrary); he does little more than summarize the speeches of Study, Clergye, Scripture, and the Dreamer in Passus x, though the sermons and religious writings of the fourteenth century indicate the particular relevance in the poem of many of the topics discussed; he dismisses Ymagynatyf's reference to the three kinds of Baptism and by-passes the problem of the salvation of the heathen; although he illustrates contemporary notions of 'patient poverty' with well-chosen quotations on pp. 73-74, he does not seem to understand that the poverty advocated by Patience is evangelical poverty, and that the argument of the poem is here carried a stage further from Ymagynatyf's elementary teaching in Passus xii; nor does he notice the many references to priests and religious in Passus xv, indicating this next stage, Dobet, which in the structural framework of the poem denotes in a general way the Contemplative life. As he goes through Dobet, Mr. Frank's summaries become more straightforward and his commentary thinner: yet much is contained in the long speeches of Abraham, Spes, and the Samaritan which

serves
analys
in his
of the
lines i
Cham
point.
he doe
povert
on U
strugg
ing H
estab
specif
New
it will
value.
many
freque
dream
refer
is adn
often
in this

The V
Pp.
It i
the m
'Wake
'Town
of the
been
The e
ton L
and c
the pa
Under
forma
that t
too po
his ve
the ol

serves to bind the various parts of the poem into a whole. It is, however, in his analysis of Dobest that Mr. Frank fails signally to deal with what Langland says in his poem. Passus xix explicitly represents the foundation and organization of the Church: one can avoid that conclusion only by disregarding most of the lines in the passus, as Mr. Frank does; and for that reason, he misrepresents Chambers's interpretation of Dobest, on which he adversely comments at this point. And he is so anxious to come to the Friars at the end of Passus xx that he does not perceive how Need's speech—in praise of temperance and evangelical poverty—excellently summarizes the whole work; nor how the first set of attacks on Unity—which take up the most space in the passus—denote the constant struggle of the Church in time against the world, the flesh, and the devil (recalling Holy Church's warning and teaching in Passus i). Only when Langland has established the natural culmination of his grand scheme does he turn to the specific contemporary attack on Unity, that of the Friars.

Nevertheless, whatever may be said about limitations such as these, one feels it will be generally agreed that Mr. Frank's analysis of the three lives is of great value. It is always direct, cutting down to the main line of thought through the many aspects of his complex subject which Langland loves to indicate. It is frequently illuminating, as in the discussion of Wit's speech in Passus ix; of the dream within a dream in Passus xi; of much of Passus xii and xiii. His constant reference to the body of criticism already existing in periodical and essay form is admirably comprehensive; and his quotations from contemporary documents often illustrate Langland's thought in a striking way. Mr. Frank has provided in this book an *instrument de travail* indispensable to students of *Piers Plowman*.

T. P. DUNNING, C.M.

The Wakefield Pageants in the Towneley Cycle. Edited by A. C. CAWLEY. Pp. xl+188. Manchester: University Press, 1958. 18s. net.

It has for long been acknowledged that in the six complete episodes and the minor passages which can with reasonable certainty all be attributed to the 'Wakefield Master', we have work of an order far superior to the rest of the 'Towneley' Cycle: and Dr. A. C. Cawley has now produced an attractive edition of the six pageants, which will be most welcome to those who hitherto have been obliged to prescribe the same bits from the anthologies, year after year. The editor has worked from photographs of the manuscript, now in the Huntington Library, and although comparison with England's edition shows how accurate and careful he was, this present volume is designed not to dismay readers with the palaeographic bric-à-brac which our elders thought it their duty to reproduce. Undergraduate students should be delighted with this very readable and informative book; and their teachers will be glad that they can see for themselves that the 'Master' is to be remembered for other masterpieces, as well as the almost too popular *Second Shepherds' Play*. Particularly impressive is his first pageant, his version of *The Slaughter of Abel* (it is a pity that the editor has not discarded the old Latin titles, including *Mactacio Abel* and the highly dubious *Coliphizacio*),

and especially his treatment of the character of Cain. This episode is incomplete in the York Cycle, but enough remains to show that there Cain is essentially a foul-mouthed buffoon, whereas in the Chester Plays he is a smooth-spoken, avaricious hypocrite, a 'humour'. Here, however, he is a grown man, seen in the round, exasperated by his brother's facile, optimistic piety, resenting every suggestion that they owe the fruits of their labours to any source of grace, seeking in each occasion outlet for his almost demented irascibility.

The Wakefield Master's work is full of 'social significance': the identification of Cain's offering with the Church's tithe, Herod's promise to make his counsellor pope, Mak's affectation of the language and pretensions of a king's yeoman from the South, are all calculated to touch an audience very mindful of present troubles. Yet like the author of *Piers Plowman*, with whom he has been compared, the 'Master' is himself always conscious of the great doctrinal and liturgical heritage of his Church: Cain as he conceives him is very much a 'type', a precursor of Herod; and the editor is surely wrong when he ascribes to his author's originality one feature of the 'Buffeting' Play, Christ's protracted silence. It can be seen that this is traditional in plays of the Passion. In the Chester episode (not a separate play) of the Buffeting, Christ has almost one hundred lines in which He does not speak, and Herod remarks, when Christ refuses to answer him, 'What! I ween this man is wood/Or elles dumbe and can no good'; and there are similar long periods of silence in the York trial scenes. There is authority for this in the Gospel narrative (cf. Matt. xxvi. 63), which the Church from ancient times had regarded as being typified by Isaiah liii. 7. Is it not somewhat absurd to suggest that the Second Shepherd's remark, 'as euer rede I pystyll', can possibly hint that the author was himself a sub-deacon? The remark is there firstly to furnish a rhyme for 'thistle/bristle/whistle', secondly, to introduce the shepherd's cheerfully profane comments on his wife's 'Paternoster' ('By Him that died for us all/I would I had run till I lost her'). The author is able to employ other kinds of satire for his purposes: the influence of the 'Hail' lyrics on his *Second Shepherds' Play* has often been remarked (and such lyrical influence is discernible elsewhere in this cycle, as where Christ is made, in the *Crucifixion Play*, to say 'Blo and bloody thus am I bett/Swongen with swepys and all to-swett/Mankynde, for thi mysdede . . .'); but when in the *Herod Play* the chief actor observes 'My myrthes are turned to teyn, my meknes into ire/And all for oone, I weyn, within I fare as fyre', we can hear a clear and probably conscious allusion to the 'love-longing' lyrics, themselves deriving from earlier, secular models, of Rolle and his school.

In this present edition, the introduction, bibliography, and notes are all excellent, furnishing us with valuable information lucidly presented, and, where necessary, dealing with recent controversial issues. One is compelled to agree with the editor when he criticizes Fr. Gardiner's contention that the Protestant deletions and emendations in the Towneley manuscript, themselves of quite commonplace character, were directly inspired by the instructions sent to the citizens of Wakefield from the York Diocesan Court of High Commission in 1576. As Dr. Cawley rightly says, the effect of these instructions must have been to ensure not merely the censorship but the total suppression of the plays,

as had
feature
for its
It wou
Yorksh
survive
maroo.
spellin
stoyll,
ô: yoy
difficu
monop
much
diphth
thoil '
which
work
Cawley
which
an ans
writte

Willia

Oxfo

This

excell

glossa

to C.

The

comm

of pro

its pr

titles,

famou

fensib

their

book

tions,

been

open

polen

Geor

story

quest

has to

as had already happened at York and Chester. Perhaps the least satisfactory feature of this edition, prepared as it was in a Yorkshire university famous for its dialect studies, is the perfunctory treatment of the language of the plays. It would have been of use and interest to students not familiar with modern Yorkshire speech to know how much of the Wakefield Master's vocabulary survives today in the West Riding: one thinks of such terms as his *flayde*, *dang*, *maroo*. Then the editor's acceptance of the conventional view that the many spellings in *oy* or *oi* indicate, whatever the origin (OE. *ō*: *soyne*, *noyne*, *moyne*, *stoyll*, *doyst*; OE. *o*: *hoill* 'hole', *noyse*; OE. *ā*: *hoylle* 'whole', *doyll* 'dole'; ON. *ō*: *yoyll*; ON. *ā*: *coyll*, *sloys*; OF. *o*: *toyne*, *doyll* 'pain'), a long monophthong, is difficult to reconcile with other evidence. We find places where such earlier monophthongs rhyme with OF. *oi*—5.334-7 and 5.379-82, for instance—and, much more important, in the West Riding today there are still traces of a sporadic diphthongization of OE. *o* to [oi] in such dialect pronunciations as *hoil* 'hole', *thoil* 'endure', *coil* 'coal', *Royd* 'clearing'. These 'graphies', and the diphthongs which they may indicate, are not peculiar in the Towneley manuscript to the work of the Wakefield Master, and it would have been of great value had Dr. Cawley used linguistic criteria also in his analysis of those parts of the cycle which seem to be the Master's work, because that might have helped towards an answer to the still disputed question whether the whole cycle was in fact written in and for Wakefield.

ERIC COLLEDGE

William Dunbar. Poems. Edited by JAMES KINSLEY. Pp. xxviii+160. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958. 12s. 6d. net.

This first volume in the new Clarendon Medieval and Tudor Series offers an excellent selection of some fifty of Dunbar's poems, with introduction, notes, glossary, and six pages of 'appreciations' ranging from John Pinkerton's (1786) to C. S. Lewis's (1954).

The series is directed, we are told, towards 'the university student' and 'the common reader', and it would not be unfair to point out that a certain austerity of presentation may make this opening volume less enticing, having regard to its prospective audience, than it might have been. The poems appear without titles, though some titles are mentioned in the notes, and a few of the more famous ones are given in parenthesis in the list of contents. This may be defensible on scholarly grounds, but the titles have become traditional now, and their absence will make the poems more difficult to refer to, especially if the book is used for teaching purposes. The glossary is rather laconic in its explanations, e.g. *gat a blek* (p. 24), *far but* (p. 39), *lude* (p. 107). Interest could have been added, particularly for the general reader, if the critical windows had been opened a little wider. Mention of things like the 'Not Burns but Dunbar' polemics of the modern Scottish Renaissance movement; the settings by Francis George Scott of Dunbar's poems in a modern musical idiom; Eric Linklater's story *Kind Kitty*—all this could have been of relevance in discussing the central question (for the non-academic reader) of what value we honestly think Dunbar has today. When Professor Kinsley notes the praise given by Dunbar's rival poet

Kennedy to the Gaelic tongue as 'all trew Scottis mennis lede', he comments nicely—'a doctrine still preached', and the note comes alive at once. A freer use of comment of this kind would be appreciated, I am sure, by the reader the series is intended to attract.

Dunbar is one of those writers, like Marlowe or Swift, whom it is possible to dislike quite strongly, even while the power of their work is felt. There is something frightening about his poetry, and we surmise there must have been something rather frightening about Dunbar himself. What disturbs us most, perhaps, is the spectacle of such intense energy devoting itself indifferently now to a splendid hymn on the Resurrection of Christ, and now to the scarifying jovialities of the flyting with Kennedy. In both these poems Dunbar is perfectly serious, and is writing as well as he knows how, according to what he feels are the rules of each genre. Mr. Kinsley is fully justified in printing part of the *Flyting* as well as the *Resurrection*, and it does not suffer by comparison. To read these two high-powered productions, and then to turn to a page of Chaucer, is to risk wondering whether Chaucer's poetry is poetry at all, and not some pleasant substitute for the genuine fiery article. This, of course, is the crucial point; for we know very well that Dunbar has not Chaucer's breadth of outlook or his humanity, and we can quickly resent the writer who seems to be bewitching us with vocabulary and rhythm. Yet admitting Chaucer's greatness is the first step towards admitting Dunbar's importance, because if Dunbar can force us momentarily—as I am certain he can—to question Chaucer's poetic status, it argues in him something more than a mere verbal virtuosity. Chaucer, though no virtuoso, was no novice either, and Dunbar's superior technical qualifications would not in themselves account for the effect he has on our view of Chaucer. No; Dunbar brings the note of an alien tradition, partly from Scottish popular poetry, partly from the northern alliterative school, partly from the still separate Scottish ethos and environment, and as Matthew Arnold confidently instanced Villon as having a kind of seriousness that was not to be found in Chaucer (though Chaucer was the greater poet), so too we can find in Dunbar a dark and wild intensity, an arresting unexpectedness, which is in its own off-beat way a contribution to the criticism of life.

Mr. Kinsley in his introduction seems unwilling to press Dunbar's claims as a poet. 'His eye seldom reached beyond the fringe, or his mind beneath the surface, of that now remote Stewart court which was his milieu.' If this was true, would he be worth reprinting? Surely it is wrong to suggest that Dunbar is no more than a 'court makar', or that he is superficial and unedifying. When he addresses the scholars and men of science of his time, he implores them

To us be myrrouris in your governance
And in our darknes be lampis in schyning,
Or than in frustar is your lang leirning;
Giff to your sawis your deidis contrair be,
Your maist accuser salbe your awin cunning.

These lines, which can still come home to us with force, are not the only ones where Dunbar shows himself to have something to say. The editor rightly allows

the poet the virtues of 'sheer style, an original humour, and imagination'; but these have already been much written about. It would have been helpful, and interesting, if Mr. Kinsley had felt disposed to give the subject-matter of the poems more serious consideration.

These are only incidental criticisms, however, of an admirable volume that deserves to be widely used.

EDWIN MORGAN

The Paul's Cross Sermons 1534-1642. By MILLAR MACLURE. Pp. x+262. Toronto: University Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1958. 45s. net.

This is a well-written and well-informed account of an important and characteristically English institution. Professor MacLure has divided it into five chapters, or sections, between which there is often a good deal of overlapping, and it is not always apparent why the treatment of any particular topic should be more appropriate to one rather than to another.

In his first section, 'Antiquarian', his intention seems to be to describe the history of the institution as such, with the minimum of reference to particular historical events. The Sermon at Paul's Cross seems to have become an established institution as early as 1361, but the principles (or methods) of selecting preachers probably developed gradually. By Tudor and Stuart times the pulpit was supplied by a combination of statutory appointment and occasional selection. On the one hand, the Lady Margaret lecturers in Divinity at both universities were required to preach at Paul's Cross every two years, and it was the duty and privilege of the canons and prebendaries of the Cathedral; on the other hand, it seems to have been the duty of the Bishop of London, who often preached there himself, to keep the pulpit regularly supplied, and the general practice was to choose present or past members of each university in turn. Nevertheless, although it was from the Bishop of London that these occasional preachers derived their immediate authority, the Bishop himself was often directed by, and often sought, the advice of the Council, especially in times of crisis; and he was at all times subject to the pressures of influential persons on behalf of their protégés. Preachers seem also to have intrigued for selection by their own efforts, either in order to express some passionately held conviction, or simply in order to gain a little advantageous publicity. In fact, in this as in most other public offices during those days of comparatively unorganized government, we can perceive how certain general policies, principles, and intentions were continually modified, or even thwarted, by all manner of private interests and ambitions. Nevertheless, the government often used the sermon at Paul's Cross as a means for issuing what, in the jargon of today, are called 'inspired statements'; and Mr. MacLure well remarks that in the long continuance of the rituals of public recantation and public penance we may observe the continuance of a conception commonly overlooked by social historians, that of a Christian society in which the Commons are directed by wise and righteous governors in such a manner as to promote the welfare of the whole body politic (p. 17). Here, perhaps, Mr. MacLure has overlooked the fact that the 'wise and righteous governors'

of the various anti-Christian societies of today would claim that their own rituals of public recantation are inspired by precisely similar ideals.

In the second section, 'Historical', there is much both in comment and in quotation that will enable students of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century literature to see the subjects of their study in clearer perspective. Donne, for example, had many predecessors in pope-baiting (p. 66), and his praise, not only of James I but of Elizabeth, should cause no surprise, for, after the conspiracies of 1586, the theme of 'thankful remembrance' became an established feature of Paul's Cross sermons for the next half-century. On p. 88 there is a quotation from Bacon which to me at least is new, and which confirms my long-held conviction that Shakespeare's 'mortal moon' sonnet alludes to the unexpectedly peaceful transition from Elizabeth to James. Although, after the accession of James I, when the Lords, under the influence of the Bishops, were so often at odds with the Commons on ecclesiastical questions, the Paul's Cross pulpit was no longer so effective as a direct agent of the Crown, preachers dwelt with ever-increasing emphasis and unanimity on the duty of obedience to authority in Church and State, and expatiated upon the theme of order and hierarchy as eloquently as so many of our pupils have now learnt to do in their essays and examination papers (p. 107); and both in this (pp. 96-97) and in the following section (p. 118) he remarks upon what seems to him the complacent satisfaction with which preachers continually exhorted their hearers to count their blessings and to contrast the happy and prosperous condition of England with that of other European countries. This is a theme which Donne, whose representativeness, despite the originality of his genius, becomes increasingly clear from a study of this book, frequently treats in his sermons, as does Clarendon, in a notable passage in his *History*, where he insists upon what seems to him the monstrous folly and ingratitude of those who rebelled against the King. There is a paradox here, a contrast between grounds for contentedness and grounds for discontentedness, which Mr. MacLure ought perhaps to have elaborated a little.

In his third section, 'Sociological', Mr. MacLure has selected from the Paul's Cross sermons utterances on a variety of 'burning questions' which might, of course, be supplemented from hundreds of other sources, but which it is convenient to have thus brought together and illuminated by the author's commentary: the disappearance of the 'old order', the widespread pillaging of the Church (a most important subject, whose consequences have recently been investigated by Mr. Christopher Hill), the 'contempt of the clergy', the sinfulness (for puritans) of plays (a matter on which Mr. MacLure has a very illuminating observation on p. 140). The fourth section, 'Homiletic', concerned mainly with matters of style and structure, is perhaps a little slight. The fifth, 'Conclusion', is admirable, and contains a passage that must be quoted:

That English sobriety, at its worst philistine, at its best comely, which stands at the opposite pole of religious experience and expression to the brilliant and passionate achievement of the Counter-Reformation, is reflected in these sermons. There is no other word for it but biblical. The metamorphosis of the Bible into an 'English book' was complete, and profound in its effects. The chronicles of Judah were interfoliated with those of Lancaster and York; the psalms mingled

with
every
Cove
visi
ident
serm

TH
have
(and
survi

Shak
19
M
and
Rich
tion
pessi
inter
on C
other
M
never
to be
prose
extre
not c
Th
right
ends
spear
trate
the c
ance
man
think
fact
rath
last
mech
wisd
less
may

with the native songs; the prophets were reformers; the Apocalypse blazed in every comet, every summer storm; the Lord addressed Adam in the language of Coverdale and the Hampton Court committee. 'God is English.' Not until the visions of 'English Blake' does one find again in English writing that prophetic identification of past and present, Israel and England, which animates these sermons and others of their kind. (p. 173)

The last portion of the book, 'Register', is a record of all sermons known to have been preached at Paul's Cross between 1534 and 1642, with references to (and sometimes summaries of) both printed sermons and, where such have not survived, records of sermons in letters, state papers, and other documents.

J. B. LEISHMAN

Shakespeare from Richard II to Henry V. By DEREK TRAVERSI. Pp. viii+198. London: Hollis and Carter, 1958. 30s. net.

Many years ago Mr. Traversi contributed to *Scrutiny* essays on *Henry IV* and *Henry V*. He has now revised and expanded these and added an essay on *Richard II*. The book as a whole provides an intelligent and subtle interpretation of the major Histories, and it is to be hoped that the publishers are unduly pessimistic when they say that the book 'completes Mr. Traversi's detailed interpretation of the Shakespeare corpus' for he has not yet collected his essays on *Othello* and *King Lear* and one would like to have his interpretations of the other great Tragedies.

Mr. Traversi has obvious limitations. He seems to distrust the theatre and never to visualize the Histories with which he deals as acting plays; he appears to be somewhat deficient in humour and deals with Falstaff too solemnly; his prose style lacks distinction; and he sometimes carries his analytical method to extremes. It says much for his real quality as a critic that these limitations are not disastrous.

The least satisfactory chapter is the one on *Richard II*. Although Mr. Traversi rightly observes (p. 16) that 'the varied use of poetic artifice for dramatic ends is characteristic of *Richard II*', he is not always sufficiently aware of Shakespeare's immaturity in 1595. He ascribes to traits of character what may illustrate only Shakespeare's occasional failure at this time to vary his verse to suit the different characters. When, for example, he says that the 'rhetorical utterance' of Bolingbroke and Mowbray in the first scene 'rises indeed, but less to manly directness than to a pitch of strained and hysterical artifice'; or when he thinks that in Gaunt's consolation of Bolingbroke on his banishment 'he is in fact subduing feeling to expression, making of emotion a decorative subject rather than a reality'; or when he suggests that the opening parallel of Richard's last long speech is 'thoroughly artificial', that 'the succession of ideas is rather mechanical than revealing', and that 'the general impression is of aphoristic wisdom using familiar illustrations . . . to point an attitude which strikes us less as a tragic reflection than as an academic exercise in poetic pessimism', we may suspect that he is crediting Shakespeare with a subtlety that he did not

then possess, and that the conventionality (which Mr. Traversi possibly exaggerates) of all these passages is due to the poet's limitations, rather than to intentional traits of his characters.

In the chapter on *Henry IV*, Mr. Traversi owes something, as he acknowledges, to 'Notes on Comedy' by L. C. Knights (though this essay is not included in *Explorations* as he states), but his interpretation of both the *Henry IV* plays, based as it is on a close reading of the text, adds to our understanding. He brings out clearly, for example, the function of disease imagery in Part 2, and shows that

just as the remedy to political anarchy lies in unquestioned allegiance to an authority divinely constituted, so does personal coherence depend upon the submission to reason of our uncontrolled desires. The link between the two states, political and personal, is provided in these plays by concentration upon the figure of the king.

There is nothing very new in this interpretation: what is new is the way in which Mr. Traversi illustrates it by a subtle commentary on scene after scene.

The best chapter, however, is that concerned with *Henry V*. Mr. Traversi is unable to accept either the view that the King is Shakespeare's only hero whom he admires without reserve or the contrary view that the poet was writing a pot-boiler. Shakespeare's attitude, he claims, is ambivalent. 'The simplicity of structure . . . is by no means incompatible with effects of a less direct and heroic kind.' The description of Henry's transformation 'barely conceals the presence of a subsistent irony'. The bishops who justify the war are 'almost exclusively concerned to maintain their temporal advantages'. Henry is in some respects like Angelo and like the man in the *Sonnets* who had 'power to hurt', 'the man who is cold, impassive as stone before the claims of his own humanity'. Although Henry is not deaf to the voice of conscience, he is always anxious to use the connivance of others 'to obtain the justification which he continually, insistently requires'. Shakespeare is concerned with 'the concept of a necessary order based on kingship'; but he is also concerned with 'the stress laid on the individual by the inhuman nature of the vocation thus confided in him'. He was therefore able to write what on one level is a great patriotic, almost an epic, drama—and perhaps Mr. Traversi tends to undervalue the Agincourt scenes—but on another level the play is an absorbing psychological study of the spiritual maiming of the ruler by virtue of his office. The play

may have satisfied the demands of patriotic orthodoxy at Elizabeth's court; but Shakespeare had the gift of fulfilling obligations of this kind without being deterred from his deeper purposes, and this conclusion, while it confirms Henry's characteristic virtues, limits firmly the range of emotions which he is capable of feeling.

Mr. Traversi in his interesting study does not allow sufficiently for the many passages in the play which are flat and pedestrian, the level as a whole being very much below *Henry IV*. He admits that Henry's speech before Harfleur could 'be described in terms of the early Shakespeare somewhat painstakingly sticking to his chronicle purposes', but he claims that there is a note of detachment in the lines. But, if not here, certainly in the exposition of the Salic Law, we may suppose that Shakespeare's imagination was not engaged.

KENNETH MUIR

Othello
[new
195]

The
largely
Ridley
He ho
Unlik
reason
while
provid
the gr
than t
wheth
of the
or alt
actors
was n

Mr
not, I
than i
is an
In th
at II.
order
sophi
cerne
In ge
exam
only
is to
assev
wind

M
boun
becar
that
give
of th
This
carry
not a
hand
elsev
your

Othello. Edited by M. R. RIDLEY. Pp. lxx+246 (The Arden Shakespeare [new edition]. General editor: Una Ellis-Fermor). London: Methuen, 1958. 21s. net.

The Old Arden *Othello*, edited by H. C. Hart, was like most editions based largely on the Folio text. The New Arden closely follows the Quarto, and Mr. Ridley devotes the greater part of his Introduction to justifying his preference. He holds, following Greg, that the copy for Q was a transcript from foul papers. Unlike Greg he argues that the transcript was early, for the not very convincing reason that 'the private collector would be more likely to want his transcript while the play was new' (p. xlii). He rejects as inconclusive the evidence, provided by the frequent spellings 'em' and 'ha', for a late Jacobean date, on the grounds that such spellings may have originated with the compositor rather than the transcriber. The basis for F—Mr. Ridley does not reach a conclusion whether it was printed from manuscript or a corrected quarto—was a transcript of the original prompt-book (p. xliii). This second transcript embodied 'additions or alterations made by Shakespeare himself, to colour a colourless part, or actors' requests which he accepted; there would also, if the second transcript was made by the prompter, be almost certainly some memorial contamination'.

Mr. Ridley's arguments cannot be fully examined in a brief space. He is not, I think, successful in showing that Q is in general closer to Shakespeare than is F. It is true that F contains sophistications ('interim' for 'nicke' at v. ii. 318 is an example), but a considerable number of its variants cannot be so described. In the case of such a variant as 'tyre the Ingeniuer' (Q 'beare all excellency') at II. i. 65, there is no warrant for saying that Shakespeare introduced it in order to 'colour a colourless part'—in other words that he was in a sense a sophisticator of his own work. The Q variant is a phrase which anyone concerned with simplifying the text might have used. F is distinctively Shakespearian. In general Mr. Ridley tends to do less than justice to F. His discussion, for example, of F's 'liberall as the North' (v. ii. 221) is inadequate. He mentions only that Hart, 'making the best of a doubtful case, thinks that the reference is to the north country, and the freedom of northerners' speech especially in asseverations', and ignores *O.E.D.* (*North*, sb. B. 4), where 'north' = north wind, which gives excellent sense.

Mr. Ridley's editorial procedure seems to me ill-judged. He does not feel bound to admit even alterations which he thinks were made by Shakespeare, because 'second thoughts are not always improvements' (p. xliv). He holds that rather than give an eclectic text 'it is much more helpful to the reader to give him Q1, cured of obvious errors, and let him make up his own mind which of the divergences of F he will admit to the final text that he makes for himself'. This is surely a failure of editorial responsibility. Nor does Mr. Ridley always carry out this procedure consistently. At v. ii. 13 the Q reading 'returne' is not an obvious error, but it is rejected for 'relume' (F 're-Lume'). On the other hand he carries his devotion to Q to the point of adopting forms which he elsewhere argues are compositorial in origin. Thus at I. ii. 59 he has 'Keep up your bright swords, for the dew will rust 'em'. He is to be congratulated, when

he quotes this line in the Introduction (p. 1), on forbearing to follow his own text.

Mr. Ridley does, however, justify the adoption of some Q readings which many editors have rejected—for example, 'set phrase' (F 'soft phrase') at I. iii. 82, and 'banning shore' (F 'Foaming Shore') at II. i. 11. He also makes out a good case for some Q readings which have been thought to be vulgarizations. This is particularly so in regard to some of the oaths, such as Othello's 'Zouns' at III. iv. 95. He is, I think, right in holding that Q is not a memorially contaminated text.

The explanatory notes are often useful, especially for their quotation of parallels in Shakespeare's other plays and for the light they throw on points of dramatic significance. In Section 4 of the Introduction, 'The Play and the Characters', Mr. Ridley follows in the Bradley tradition. He argues cogently for the view of Othello as 'the Noble Moore'. He sees 'the Othello who sends his last message to the senate and dies upon a kiss' as being 'again the Othello who stood before the senate in Venice and greeted Desdemona in Cyprus'. The evidence he presents for a negro Othello is compelling. He points out that, dramatically, a negro Othello is required.

There are eight appendixes concerned with textual matters. These appendixes include a listing of 'Q only' and 'F only' passages, and variants in stage-directions, while one contains an examination of Dr. Alice Walker's theory of the text. Another appendix gives a new translation, partly abridged, of Cinthio's *novella*.

J. K. WALTON

The London Shakespeare. Edited by JOHN MUNRO with an introduction by G. W. G. WICKHAM. Vol. I, pp. lxxxiv+12+678; Vol. II, pp. vi+679-1470; Vol. III, pp. viii+772; Vol. IV, pp. viii+773-1514; Vol. V, pp. viii+886; Vol. VI, pp. vi+887-1690. London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1958. £7. 7s. net.

The *London Shakespeare* includes in its six volumes the Comedies (I-II), the Histories (with extracts from *Sir Thomas More*) and Poems (III-IV), and the Tragedies (V-VI). Within this classification the plays are arranged in order of composition (in the main according to Chambers's chronology). Vol. I opens with a general introduction by G. W. G. Wickham, a 'Select List of Authorities and Key to Abbreviations used', and the prefatory matter to the First Folio; Vol. VI concludes with a Glossary (56 pp.). Each play is preceded by a separate introduction (of about ten or a dozen pages) on its textual history, sources, date, and literary interest; and, apart from occasional appendix notes on problems which call for fuller treatment than footnotes allow, the rest of the critical apparatus is presented below the text.

The appearance of the text is attractive, for the type-measure accommodates not only a complete line of verse but also the shorter type of stage direction and a line numbering by fives. All this is achieved without crowding and the result is that the pattern of the verse is hardly ever disturbed by turn-overs—a rare pleasure in editions of Shakespeare. The distinctive layout of prose is equally

attractive. So far as I have checked the texts, printer's errors are rare and the modernization of punctuation and spelling is, for the most part, thorough, though it is not apparent why some archaic spellings have been preserved (e.g. 'and' = if) and others modernized: still less is it clear why 'biles' (= boils) is retained in *Troilus and Cressida* but modernized in *Coriolanus*. Inconsistencies of this kind are, of course, unavoidable in any attempt to compromise between old and modern spelling, though, in the present case, some at least might have been removed had Mr. Munro lived to give his texts a final revision.

His death has, indeed, robbed us of much that might have clarified his principles both in such matters and in more important ones—notably his principles in emendation and in the selection of his critical apparatus. My impression is that he aimed at steering a course between independent emendation on the one hand and a superstitious reverence for the readings of the early texts on the other—a course less justifiable today than in the past when less was known about the transmission of Shakespeare's plays. Whether Mr. Munro appreciated recent research upon the latter is, indeed, doubtful. In *Richard III*, an obvious test case, he refers in his introduction to Daniel's conclusion about the copy for F1, but without observing its consequences; hence, though rightly basing his text on the Folio, he admits into it readings originating in Qq 2-6, in spite of the warnings provided by Thompson's Arden edition.

Questions of this kind might have been reconsidered had the texts received a final overhaul, for there are, I think, signs of a growing awareness of their importance in the later volumes. On the other hand, in the introduction to *The Merry Wives*, the first of the Comedies to present a complicated textual situation, nothing could be more confusing for those unfamiliar with the problems than the following passage on the Q text:

Lapse of memory, and, in some cases, deliberate intention, may account for substitution of words and minor changes. Some substitutions may be correct, and have been accepted. Various phrases in Q which are omitted in F are useful in clarifying the text. Some of these have been adopted in edited Folio texts: but a certain conservatism in this practice seems advisable. In a few cases alternative passages in Q appear superior to F. Some of the additions in Q seem based on recollection of stage business. The Counting-House in Q, instead of the Closet in F, seemingly derives from the early text of the play. So also do the name Gillian applied to Mother Prat, and Garmombles. The reporter included in the Q text a line from *Hamlet* and *grate why*, peculiar to Q, is identified by H. C. Hart as mutilated Welsh.

This is a cloudily worded résumé of opinions and means simply that (1) some of the variants are due to scribal or printing-house errors, (2) others are due to memorial perversion in Q, and (3) others suggest that Q represented a somewhat different version of the matter from F's. The significance of (3) can, of course, only be determined after (1) and (2) have been isolated, and I should myself include under (1), as Q misreadings, 'Garmombles' (= German devils) and 'grate why' (= God be wi'y), and under (2) Q's 'Counting-house' (see *O.E.D.*) as implying a 'closet'. It is not characteristic of Mr. Munro to write in so muffled a manner, for his introductions are in other respects informative,

succinct, and good reading. The fact is, I think, that on textual problems he had not made up his mind.

This lack of grip on the crucial question of the transmission of Shakespeare's plays impairs the usefulness of his critical apparatus, which is not, in any case, as easy to consult as one would wish. A heavier type for the line reference and lemma would here have assisted readers, and the more so since the notes are so cluttered with variants of no critical importance (such as mere misprints in the later Folios) that significant variants are obscured or crowded out. The most significant variants are, of course, those *substantive* emendations of earlier editors which are reconcilable with what is now known or surmised about the transmission of the text. Since the addition or omission of a final 's' is one of the commonest errors in early prints, nothing, for instance, is more likely than that 'hand' (JC, III. i. 259, 'Woe to the hand that shed this costly blood') is an error for 'hands', and the latter emendation, accepted by Dover Wilson, should therefore have been recorded. On the other hand, it is of no moment that F's 'where' (JC, I. i. 61, 'See *where* their basest metal be not moved') has been spelt by editors in a variety of ways, and a note such as

61 whe'er] Ff *where* Hanmer, Graik, Delius, Craig, Lobban, Kittredge, Houghton *wh'e'r* Cam, Globe, Chambers, Herford, Mason *whether* NCE *wh'e'er*

is a waste of space and the reader's time, for the variants represent no more than one way or another of modernizing the F reading. Hundreds of notes of this kind could with advantage have been omitted.

This method of recording variants is, in any case, cumbersome and liable to lay traps for readers who are accustomed to find the lemma followed by the siglum of the edition whose reading is adopted; and any reader who considers the number and the character of the editions collated will readily perceive that an annual supplement would be necessary to keep this kind of trivial record up to date. Whether the readings of the new Arden edition, or Alexander's, or Sisson's, are cited seems to depend, indeed, not so much on the date of their publication as on the stage Mr. Munro's edition had reached when they appeared, and to have made a record like the one quoted uniform for every play would have had the edition repeatedly in the melting-pot. Difficulties of this kind may perhaps, in the first instance, have discouraged the systematic use of Dover Wilson's edition. This was a mistake, for it would at least have drawn attention to serious omissions in the textual apparatus, of which I notice more than there should be in *As You Like It*. For critical purposes, this kind of apparatus is, in short, of very little use and what is most valuable in it is the occasional discussion of readings.

What is attractive in Mr. Munro's texts is that they are, in general, less conservative than many recent editions. Like the (old) Cambridge editors, he appears to have preferred the more literate reading to the 'harder' one, the normal expression to an oddity. To this extent, I find his texts agreeable; but they are not well-founded, and those who look for the fruits of recent scholarship will be disappointed.

ALICE WALKER

Shake
brie
The
of its
'Last
cellan
and s
to Sha
numb
The
which
It is c
betwe
with t
haps
dozen
wheth
ing us
interp
admir
both
re-cre
talking
from J
Her
and le
of Clo
triple
an ani
Posthu
Some
ance',
of all
ever 'e
the en
The q
Roman
neglec
wines
Cliff
last pl
one ha
New
a muc

Shakespeare Survey II. Edited by ALLARDYCE NICOLL. Pp. x+224. Cambridge: University Press, 1958. 27s. 6d. net.

The eleventh number of this invaluable series maintains the high standard of its predecessors. It falls into three sections, the first concerned with the 'Last Plays', the second including papers on topics of more general and miscellaneous interest, and the third consisting of the usual 'International Notes', and surveys of the year's productions of the plays and the year's contributions to Shakespearean study. There is also a most useful general index to the first ten numbers.

The opening paper is a study by Philip Edwards of the main types of criticism which have in the past fifty years been applied to the Romances taken as a group. It is clear, comprehensive, and eminently fair, though one needs little reading between the lines to be aware that the writer is in only very qualified sympathy with the symbolism-hunters and the 'mythopoeists'. Is the general effect perhaps faintly depressing? To illustrate his points Mr. Edwards takes 'some two dozen studies' (which in fact stretch to thirty). Is it permissible to wonder whether Shakespeare the playwright and poet is not in some danger of disappearing under the mass of devoted and ingenious—sometimes over-ingenious—interpretation? Is he perhaps laughing from a cloud? If, in his lifetime, some admirer had congratulated him on having so ably created in Perdita 'a symbol both of the creative powers of nature, physical fertility, and of healing and re-creation of the mind', would he even have understood what his admirer was talking about? This type of criticism reaches its peak in two remarkable sentences from J. P. Brockbank on Imogen:

Her votaries from Swinburne onwards may be allowed their extravagances and let pass with an 'Ods pittikins' . . . When she lies 'dead' alongside the body of Cloten in the clothes of Posthumus, the spectacle is an evocative symbol of a triple sacrifice (though the word is too strong)—of an innocence that will revive, an animal barbarity which is properly exterminated, and a duplicity (involving Posthumus) which has still to be purged.

Some of us, in spite of Mr. Brockbank's contempt and his patronising 'allowance', will continue to be votaries, and to see Imogen as one of the loveliest of all Shakespeare's women rather than as a component part of a symbol, however 'evocative'. And we may take courage from some salutary sentences towards the end of Mr. Edwards's paper:

The question which too few ask is, what kind of emotional response were the Romances designed to arouse? Has not the 'delight' of romance been rather neglected? Romance surely has its own catharsis in the satisfaction of those who witness the reconciliations and reunions which close each of the plays.

Clifford Leech contributes a most interesting study of the structure of the last plays on terms of 'cycle and crisis', which is, I think, just, and, as soon as one has discovered what he means by 'cycle', illuminating.

Nevill Coghill comes down firmly and refreshingly to brass tacks, and delivers a much-needed counterblast to the contemptuous comments of many critics

on the stage-craft of *The Winter's Tale*. But unhappily he overplays his hand, and, having good evidence for a good case, weakens it by adducing evidence much more dubious. Having rightly stressed Polixenes' emphasis on 'nine months', he says that Hermione 'is *visibly pregnant*', and that this fact about her has been grasped by the audience at her first entry. It *may* have been grasped, but that depends on how she was dressed. It is clear from the comments of the farthingale-exasperated Bosola that neither he nor the audience have any ocular evidence of the Duchess's condition. Again, Professor Coghill is right in saying that an actor can 'personate a bear with an absolutely calculated degree of comic effect', but he cannot, I think, have it both ways, and assume that the *personated* bear can also be terrifying, which it is essential for his argument that the bear should be and which a real bear might have been. Again, he is so anxious to exhibit the narration of Perdita's recognition as a masterpiece—which it is—that he seems to miss the point that the representation of it on the stage would have disastrously weakened the second recognition of the statue scene. Shakespeare's stage-craft is no less, perhaps even more, masterly because he was solving a dramatic problem, but it was a problem. None the less this paper is a piece of cogent criticism from a writer who knows the stage and regards the play as a play.

There are briefer scholarly studies, which there is no space to do more than mention, on Shakespeare's hand in *The Two Noble Kinsmen*, on Music in the Romances, and on Prospero's Magic, from Kenneth Muir, J. M. Nosworthy, and C. J. Sisson.

In the second section of the volume Dover Wilson rounds off his survey of 'The New Way with Shakespeare's Texts' in an enlightening paper which will appeal alike to specialists and non-specialists. There are also several most entertaining oddments.

In the third section Roy Walker, in reviewing the past year's productions, achieves two very difficult aims. In his criticisms he makes no attempt to be dreadfully impersonal and impartial, but his personal criticisms are eminently fair and balanced; and further he has the rare gift of making the reader *see* a performance which he had no chance of seeing on the stage.

M. R. RIDLEY

The Changeling. By THOMAS MIDDLETON and WILLIAM ROWLEY. Edited by N. W. BAWCUTT. Pp. lxviii+140. (The Revels Plays. General editor: CLIFFORD LEECH.) London: Methuen, 1958. 18s. net.

This is the first volume in what promises to be a most useful series of editions of plays by Shakespeare's contemporaries done in the manner of the Arden Shakespeare. *The Changeling* is an excellent choice to start with and Mr. Bawcutt has handled it in a competent and scholarly way. His introduction, without having anything spectacular to add, clearly sets out what is known about the two authors and the stage-history and publication of the play; it carefully traces the tragic progress of the heroine who becomes the 'creature' of her wicked deed and dies in the recognition of her own 'deformity'; it synthesizes recent critical

opinion on such problems as the nature of the collaboration and the artistic relation between the two plots. On controversial matters Mr. Bawcutt shows a level-headed judgement with a healthy vein of scepticism, which I wish he had extended to the critical notion that Middleton's comedies have no moral framework. His notes, though sometimes verbose, are usually pertinent and sane. And, most important, my comparison with the 1653 quarto shows the text to be impeccably accurate.

One or two reservations about the editorial procedure may nevertheless be made. The scrupulous regard for the quarto authority is admirable when it leads to the restoration of such readings as the meaningful *sound* at I. i. 117 in place of the empty editorial *found*, but it seems a pity to resist some of the natural emendations made by Dilke and Dyce. These include *have made* for *made*, III. iv. 34; *my blood* for *blood*, v. iii. 135; *circumscribes us here* for *circumscribes here*, v. iii. 164. In all these examples sense as well as metre seems to require the extra word, and it could have been supplied with the more justification since a comparison of the two versions of Franciscus's letter in IV. iii shows the quarto prone to minor omissions. (Cf. the note on IV. iii. 162.) Though some metrical roughness is a stylistic characteristic especially of Rowley, corruption may also be a cause. It seems reasonable to suspect it in a number of unmetrical contractions—*It's*, II. ii. 117; *'tis*, IV. i. 104; *I'm*, IV. ii. 58; *for't*, v. iii. 66; *she's*, v. iii. 107. More readiness to emend would not have been incompatible with Mr. Bawcutt's view of the transmission of the text, but this is a matter that could with advantage have been investigated in more detail. It may well be right to link the quarto with the promptbook, but three imperative stage-directions give us little to go on, and no clear evidence is offered for the assumption of an intervening transcript. Most of what are taken to be scribal misunderstandings (see, for example, the notes at I. i. 57, II. i. 138) could equally be due to a compositor.

There is also in my judgement a slight confusion about the purposes of a modern-spelling text. Whatever advantage there may be in recording the accidents of the original, it is one which the modernizing editor, for the sake of other advantages, has elected to forgo. If a distinction is to be made between *-ed* and *'d* in the past forms of the verb, it must obviously be made according to the pronunciation required by the verse and not in subservience to the quarto spelling. Yet this edition follows the quarto in printing *continued*, *followed*, *borrowed*, *entered* (to go no farther than the first act) when the metre shows that the *-ed* is not syllabic. At the same time forms like *chang'd* and *rehears'd* are printed in prose, where the contraction is in modern English meaningless. Similarly, the forms *murd'ress* and *murderer*, when the metre requires both to be disyllabic, merely preserve a meaningless variation in the quarto. Here the example of some, but not all, of the Arden Shakespeare volumes has, I must think, been unhappy. The punctuation too, though in general sensitive and thoughtful, is inclined to conform to the original too closely. For it is axiomatic that if the punctuation claims to be modernized, then all the stops must have their modern value. Editors are reluctant to accept the obvious fact that seventeenth-century texts often use the comma and the colon where we should use

the full-stop—as is well illustrated here in i. i. 59. In a modernized text, fidelity to the intentions of the original will be achieved not by reproducing such stops but by—as far as possible—translating them. So in ii. i. the colons at lines 93, 113, 122 appear to me to be wrong. These of course are small matters; but they concern a fundamental principle, and this first volume will doubtless set a pattern for successors. I hope that by drawing attention to them I shall not seem unappreciative either of the general editor's skill and enterprise in guiding this new series or of the good work Mr. Bawcutt has done on this important play.

HAROLD JENKINS

The Poetical Works of John Milton. Revised edition edited by HELEN DARBISHIRE. Pp. xvi+628 (Oxford Standard Authors). London: Oxford University Press, 1958. 16s. net.

In her edition of Milton's Poems in the Oxford Standard Authors series Miss Darbishire claims that the text has been prepared to come 'as near as possible to what he himself intended'. Her case has been expounded in detail in the prefaces to the volumes which came out in 1952 and 1955, and here the argument is briefly presented in explanation of the treatment of spelling and punctuation designed to reform the supposed inconsistencies of the early printers, careful men though admittedly they were.

The system arrived at by the prolonged and minute study of *Paradise Lost* has also been applied to correct the later poems, but it is used very sparingly indeed for all that belongs to Milton's earlier years. For the 1645 pieces the corrective touches are derived chiefly from the evidence of the Trinity College Manuscript.

Miss Darbishire's methods, and especially her determination to stand by the first edition of *Paradise Lost* as her copy text, have been challenged by Professor B. A. Wright, whose text, based on the second edition and also 'reformed' but along slightly different lines, is now available for comparison in the Everyman volume of 1956. The subject has perhaps been sufficiently vexed. Those who, like Mrs. Battle, are for the rigour of the game, will find it with the fire clean and the hearth swept in *R.E.S.* for February and May 1957.

This is not the place to open up the debate again; but it may be noted that although Miss Darbishire concedes reluctantly that the second edition 'found out' (*P.L.*, i. 703) is a possible reading she continues to print 'founded'. Elsewhere (xi. 651) she prefers the first edition 'tacks' instead of second edition 'makes' but incorporates the instance (1952 preface, p. xix) among cases of readings from the second edition which she accepts. Hers would appear to be a more conservative text than Mr. Wright's, if one may judge fairly from a couple of soundings. In *Lycidas* she follows the 1645 text in some 54 minute particulars which he chooses to alter. In *Paradise Lost*, ix. 473-588, where the early editions are identical, Miss Darbishire makes 12 adjustments, Mr. Wright 30: five of these changes coincide.

To the footnotes which record the principal variants in *Paradise Lost* perhaps the following might be added:

- i. 504/5 remarking the correction by which a reference is made more accurate;
- ii. 282 where/were, a variant not noted in her larger edition;
- ii. 375 Originals/original, not noted here;
- iii. 592 the accepted emendation of 'Mettal' for the 'medal' of both editions;
- iv. 627 walks/walk;
- vii. 563 stations/station;
- x. 827 'then' omitted, regarded by Miss Darbishire as a mechanical error;
- xi. 398 maritime/maritim.

The only misprint which I have noticed is the omission of 'aerie' (*P.L.*, xi. 185 quoted in a note to p. vii). The text of the Italian poems has been in the charge of Mr. John Purves; Professor Garrod has looked after the Latin compositions. An appendix provides the translations used in the Columbia edition.

Another Appendix gives a few useful extracts from the Trinity College MS. Page 572 could have taken the flower passage from *Lycidas* where the drafting is so illuminating, but perhaps this was omitted because it had been used in facsimile as a frontispiece in 1955.

This is an admirable volume with a very pleasant page. We are now the richer in having a choice of texts, reformed upon scholarly principles, lying between the facsimiles of the manuscripts and seventeenth-century editions provided by Professor Fletcher and the modernized version hitherto current. The stimulus given towards reasoned comparison is valuable over and above the many other reasons for gratitude for a 'dull duty' so admirably discharged.

K. M. LEA

Homer und die englische Humanität. Chapmans und Popes Übersetzungskunst im Rahmen der humanistischen Tradition. By RUDOLF SÜHNEL. Pp. 222 (Buchreihe der *Anglia* 7). Tübingen: Niemeyer, 1958. DM. 18.00.

The problems raised by the translation of Homer into English have been discussed by Arnold, Ezra Pound, and many of the translators themselves. There are recent studies of Chapman's and Pope's translations, and there is plenty to read on humanism, whatever that may be. To all this Herr Sühnel adds nothing of any value. He is not one of those mentioned by Pope who 'account it a disgrace to be of the opinion of those that preceded them'. For instance, if we compare his discussion of Pope's *Iliad* with D. Knight's *Pope and the Heroic Tradition. A Critical Study of his Iliad* (1951), we find in both the same quotations, Cowper and Arnold on Pope and Milton, Wordsworth and Coleridge on Pope, Butcher and Lang on the Bible, W. P. Ker on the vogue of the heroic poem, and T. S. Eliot on the pastness of the past, and the same points about Pope: his view that the moral is concord among governors, his realization that Homer provides nature rather than perfection, his emphasis on Homer's fire, his criticisms of Chapman, his translation of *κυνὸς ὄμματ' ἔχων κραδίην δ' ἐλάφοιο*, the comparison of the death of Gorgythio in Pope with the

death of Euryalus in Dryden's *Aeneid*, and Pope's explanation and Chapman's augmentation of Hector's speech to Paris in Book vi. On Chapman's *Iliad* Herr Sühnel follows just as close behind H. C. Fay's *Chapman's Iliads of Homer* (unpublished, but in his bibliography). The 'frame' of Herr Sühnel's title is the same old frame we have seen round so many pictures: Ciceronianism, Stoicism, Demosthenes and Philip of Spain, Pitt quoting Virgil in the House.

Nevertheless, it would have been convenient to have the discussions collected in a single book if Herr Sühnel had not grafted on to them the theme that 'the continuity of English humanism is reflected in the English translations of Homer as in a focus, it carries them like a wave', by means of vague and naïve attacks, on almost every page, on post-classicism, historicism, science, democracy, specialization, realism, empiricism, and conceptual thought, which seem to imply that Pope was the last Englishman to care for human values. It is doubtful whether anything is gained by the study of 'humanism' in a single author: a truer picture emerges from Douglas Bush's two books, *Mythology and the Renaissance Tradition* and *Mythology and the Romantic Tradition*. Chapman's inaccuracies are not typical of his age, and Pope's importance is qualified by the fact that by Pope's day Homer had already made himself felt through such works as *Télémaque* and the imitations of particular beauties in Milton, La Motte, and others, which are assembled in Pope's notes. It is also odd that Pope's *Iliad* should be accepted, and not only by Herr Sühnel, as the 'translation of Pope's age', when after all not many heroes were biting the dust. Pope's use of the *Iliad* in the *Dunciad* and *Rape of the Lock* and the vogue of mock-heroism should have been discussed. Pope himself speaks of the 'wonderful simplicity of the old heroic ages', and Arnold in criticizing Maginn and treating Homer as another Dante or Michelangelo was perhaps not being historicistic enough. It is possibly Herr Sühnel's naïve sense of period—Chapman cannot supply Hector with a motive for leaving Sarpedon without his referring to 'baroque disillusion'—which blinds him to the many points of contact between Chapman and Pope. Both wrote, unlike Arnold's ideal translator, for the few, and half the time in the same metre. To Chapman Homer 'revealed mysteries', to Pope he was full of 'sacred truths afterwards taught by the prophets and apostles'. Both, while defending Homer against Virgil and Scaliger, incorporate Virgilian phrases in their translation. Both exaggerate the dramatic and moral traits in Homer's characters, and both explain the incredible as allegory. Both alter the sequence of Homer's clauses to produce climax, and both are more pointed and antithetical than Homer (Pope's 'The first in valour as the first in place' is indebted to Chapman's 'Shall not we exceed As much in merit as in noise'). Both are worried by heroes weeping, and both alter Glaucus' 'folly' in exchanging gold for bronze into generosity. Both translate women into dames, gods into heaven, and Zeus into Jove. This may or may not be humanism. One cannot discuss the nineteenth century without forgetting about Homer altogether most of the time. Herr Sühnel's last chapter runs aimlessly through the best-known nineteenth- and twentieth-century translations, briefly characterizing each. The fact is, most of them do do justice to something in Homer missed by Chapman and Pope.

C. H. SALTER

Pope and Human Nature. By GEOFFREY TILLOTSON. Pp. viii+278. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958. 25s. net.

The relationship of this book to Professor Tillotson's earlier *On the Poetry of Pope* is set out in the preface. It represents collections made in the first place for an enlarged edition of that book, but now printed separately 'as a supplement'. *On the Poetry of Pope* concentrated on style; the present work 'is mainly about the material Pope expresses'.

To reread the first book is to remember that its outstanding quality is its capacity to convey what it feels like to recognize greatness in poetry. This central capacity to see poetic power clearly and see it whole controls the mass of detail that the book contains and imposes a central sanity of judgement in a field where personal denigration or special pleading are the common rule. By the nature of its subject the new book offers less scope for these virtues. There is, of course, some overlap and there are passages of critical analysis in *Pope and Human Nature* as good as any in the earlier book. I would refer the reader particularly to pp. 73 f. on 'On a certain Lady at Court' and to pp. 199-203 on the 'Epistle to Miss Blount, on her leaving the Town, after the Coronation' where the structure of this poem is most subtly elucidated to reveal Pope in a role we seldom concede to him—that of the love poet.

But such analyses are not the staple of *Pope and Human Nature*. In this book Mr. Tillotson's central aim is to define the relationship between Pope's poetry and that basis of ordinary human attitudes, or common sense, which he calls 'Nature'. The process of definition is conducted with subtlety and controlled by common sense; we are shown how the 'difficulties' of Pope and his confinement to an eighteenth-century milieu do not make his poems local and ephemeral if only the reader brings with him enough of his own ordinary humanity. One of the best chapters (vii) examines Pope's presentation of beauty, ugliness, the grotesque, and the indecent, and here the wisdom Mr. Tillotson brings to the defence of Pope is well illustrated: 'The sensuous display [of human beauty] co-exists in vital relationship with things like love, lust, morality, social usage, money, domesticity, jealousy, envy, comfort, friendship, parenthood' (p. 86). 'It [beauty] was, at best, an embellisher. And so the crucial question for Pope was the worth of the thing embellished . . . [and, as in architecture,] beauty was ridiculous unless it embellished usefulness' (p. 89). 'Mankind . . . is never concerned with the aesthetic pure and simple' (p. 110).

Mr. Tillotson's view that Pope's 'Nature' is universal by having common sense and sanity is proved, I should say, up to the hilt, and even (it must also be said) some distance beyond. Mr. Tillotson has read extensively in all kinds of literature and is able to call on an extraordinary range of reference: on the first five pages I find footnote citations of *The Times* of 1956, Locke, Sterne, J. S. Mill, George Henry Lewes, 'the scientists called together by UNESCO', Milton, La Rochefoucauld, Dryden, Pope, and Lamb—all meticulously recorded. Such wide-ranging accuracy is indeed admirable; but it is the purpose of a book to be read, and a determination to pursue and document every thought does not make it easy to reach or recognize the central points of a book whose

method can only be described as circuitous or periphrastic. There are footnotes which supplement Twickenham annotations—"There are some six hundred varieties of moss in England, and nine hundred if liverworts are counted in" (p. 5, n. 1)—and passages in which Mr. Tillotson conducts arguments with other authors—such as Wordsworth ('Surely this is outrageous')—and *en passant* criticisms of all and sundry (e.g. '[Joyce's *Ulysses* is] unfortunately the less acceptable because of a false sophistication'). Digression is sometimes pursued for its own sake as, I suppose, a stylistic device: the word *primary* is justified by 'borrowing the term from the author of *Sohrab and Rustum*, who, in an eloquent and desperate plea, distinguished . . .'; sometimes it is pursued for the sake of paradox, as when we are told that 'Pope's wish for wildness, however, did not go unfulfilled. He found it, as Emily Brontë did, in the wildness of Nature—in the extremes of human passion in *Eloisa and Atossa*', &c. The wit here seems hard to justify in terms of the illumination provided by the *discordia concors* of Pope and Emily Brontë.

Finally, even polymathy as formidable as Mr. Tillotson's must be stronger in some fields than in others, and one can sometimes find fault with illustrative arguments drawn from other disciplines. Thus Mr. Tillotson may be correct in supposing that 'Whatever is, is RIGHT' is less jaunty than is sometimes supposed: 'The vast matter represented in the "Whatever is" is a sorry sight, and is unflinchingly shown as such in Pope's poems'; but the argument to support this (drawn from Handel's setting of the words in *Jephtha*) would seem to be technically insecure. To call the dotted rhythm 'a dignified wail, lying across the beat' is tendentious, and to call the arpeggio of the dominant ninth, which follows, 'a melancholy meander, as if aimlessly in "the labyrinth of life"' even more so. The tonality is moving from minor to major, producing the effect which authorities usually refer to as 'brightening'. I find nothing in the score to prove that Handel's interpretation of the words was the same as Mr. Tillotson's.

Tendentiousness of a similar kind appears in the handling of some other materials. On p. 232 we read: 'Pope subscribed to the old belief that to practise the art of poetry severely was to have some claim to be a good man' and a reference is given to Butcher on *Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art*. But Strabo (who provides the basis of the discussion in Butcher) and other classical authorities are saying something rather different—that a man cannot write good poetry unless he is *first* a good man; the priority of ethical to aesthetic is the whole point of the classical doctrine.

By omitting references to the critical tradition headed by the *Ars Poetica* Mr. Tillotson sometimes makes Pope seem more original than he was. Thus that 'Pope, however, was more ambitious to make common words combine as never before' is true, but Horace had commanded it:

dixeris egregie, notum si callida verbum
reddiderit iunctura novum. (47 f.)

Again, 'one of the great services that Pope rendered to English lay in his cult of conciseness. "I hate *words*", he said, "without matter". A firm rule of his was to

"... show no mercy to an empty line". Pope certainly belonged to a school of concise writers, but this goes back to Marvell and Jonson—and behind these stands the *Ars Poetica* once again:

quidquid praecipies, esto brevis, ut cito dicta
percipiant animi dociles teneantque fideles:
omne supervacuum pleno de pectore manat. (335-7)

It seems a distortion to isolate Pope from his tradition, and this is a distortion for which the whole book may be criticized. It is very proper to depart from the hackneyed lines of 'Pope as an Augustan', and to defend his morality as one which can speak to us in our own language; but if we take this more difficult course I feel we must provide more than the flat assertion: 'ordinary men, and Christians with them, must accept Pope's morality, even if they wish to make additions to it' (p. 43). In his flight from merely historical or genetic explanations Mr. Tillotson seems to have reached a point where explanations of any kind have almost vanished, and we find the book proceeding by the curiously medieval method of flat assertion, citation of authorities, and copious illustration.

To some extent the construction of the book may be held responsible for this effect of mere illustration. There is no single developing argument (which might have been used to conduct Pope out of his background and into his individual achievement) but instead a series of essays of widely different sizes (ranging from three to fifty-three pages) dealing with different aspects of 'Nature' in Pope's poetry. Some of these are more central and some more peripheral, but the book provides no criterion for judging which is which. Perhaps if the title had been *Essays on . . .* or *Chapters on . . .* it would have been easier to rest content with numerous excellencies of *Pope and Human Nature* and not to have desired the further benefit of a clearly delimited structure. G. K. HUNTER

A Tale of a Tub, To which is added The Battle of the Books and the Mechanical Operation of the Spirit. By Jonathan Swift. Edited by A. C. GUTHKELCH and D. NICHOL SMITH. Pp. lxxviii+374. Second Edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958. 50s. net.

Since its first appearance in 1920 this edition of *A Tale of a Tub* and the associated pieces has been rightly regarded as one of the finest achievements of English scholarship. It inaugurated the modern era in the critical and textual study of Swift and there has been scarcely a work on him since 1920 that has not in some measure been indebted to this monumental book. This second edition will maintain its authority for many more years. In appearance the new edition is even more handsome than the first. The book has been completely reset and the use of a larger type for the appendixes will be welcomed by every student of Swift who knows from experience how minutely and often he must work over these essential background materials. Beyond these physical improvements the passage of nearly forty years has necessitated few changes of importance in the former edition, except in the treatment of Swift's text.

Since 1920 there have been important advances in the study of bibliography

and in editorial practice generally, and a succession of editors has been at work elucidating the intricacies of Swift's text. Professor Nichol Smith, himself a pioneer in these studies and never neglectful of progress in his field, is now less conservative in the handling of his copy text than he formerly was. The problem here is as difficult as it is intriguing. The *Tale* and *The Battle of the Books* were unfortunately not reprinted in the first six volumes of Faulkner's collected edition of the *Works* (1735-8), which, having been passed for the press by Swift himself, are now accepted as the basic text for an editor. The authoritative edition for these particular pieces would therefore seem to be the first (1704), were it not for the complication that the fifth edition (1710), besides making certain alterations and omissions, is the first to contain the 'Apology', the footnotes, and the plates. Nearly all these changes, as Guthkelch and Nichol Smith were the first to demonstrate, were either made by Swift himself or at least sanctioned by him. On the other hand, he did not see the proofs of the rest of the volume, which, set from the fourth edition, retains printers' errors that had got into the intervening 'corrected' editions, each of them reprinted from the preceding one. In the circumstances any editor must feel tempted to take the first edition of the *Tale* as his copy-text and build upon it an edition incorporating the additions and changes of 1710. This, I think, would be worth attempting. Nichol Smith, no doubt wisely, has decided against the attempt. Instead, while retaining the fifth edition as his copy-text, he now departs from it freely, as Herbert Davis did in his edition of 1939, to restore numerous readings of the more reliable first edition. Furthermore, he retracts his former grant of 'superior authority' to the second edition and removes from the body of the work readings he had previously accepted from it, at the same time freshly collating all editions from the first to the fifth and extending the list of variants until it is even fuller than that provided by Davis.

There can be no doubt that the present more eclectic method improves the sense of the text and brings us closer to what Swift intended. For instance, it importantly establishes that Swift wrote (p. 215) of 'that kind of Reception' that satire meets in the world, and never pretended that it was a 'kind Reception'. Yet, because of a misprint in the fourth edition, the latter incorrect reading has gained currency and turned Swift's irony into crude sarcasm. On the other hand, the plural form 'Conclusions' (p. 234), which Nichol Smith rejects, seems to me more obviously correct than the singular noun of edns. 3-5.

Changes in the introduction are of less moment. The editor is now a little more cautious about the unsigned notes to the 1710 edition, allowing that Swift had at least sanctioned them even if he did not write them all himself (pp. xxiii-xxiv). His analysis of the evidence for the date of composition is made more precise and conclusive. He arranges the bibliography more satisfactorily in chronological order, adding fresh items and giving more information about others, including the works with titles derived from the *Tale*, and *The History of Martin*, which is now recorded as first published at The Hague by T. Johnson (p. lx). A further reference is added, from Francis Osborne, to the seventeenth-century practice of throwing a tub to a whale (p. xxx).

Beyond these minor revisions he does not go, remaining content, as before, to

provid
ments
the str
about
of idea
the fo
light t
Cabali
search
et Swi
major
thoug
tersely
overst
Battle
invest
added
cance
genera
allego
copies
Swift
Refor
strikin
drama
of M
1613.
with
could
Ad
nor s
and to
with
adduc
Swift
whos
note
has in
Dr. V
suspe
Dead
useful
Th
it ren
'with
text c

provide the literary critic with the materials of scholarship on which his assessments must be based. He has little to say about Swift's literary achievement, the structure of the *Tale*, or the quality of his wit; and he adds nothing fresh about his intentions in writing these pieces or about their place in the history of ideas. This is a little disappointing, because it was the work of these editors in the former edition (especially their invaluable annotations that brought into the light the 'dark authors' from whom Swift obtained his knowledge of Mysticism, Cabalism, Alchemy, and Rosicrucianism) that made possible the further researches of Pons, Quintana, and Starkman. The articles by Legouis on 'Marvell et Swift' and by Pons on 'Swift et Pascal' are noticed, it is true, but not Pons's major study, *Swift. Les Années de jeunesse et le 'Conte du tonneau'* (Paris, 1925), though the editor is obviously glancing at certain of Pons's contentions when he tersely notes at the foot of p. 116 that 'Swift's debt to Rabelais is absurdly overstated'. Evidently he finds no case for re-examining the relation of *The Battle of the Books* to the *Histoire poétique* of Callières in the light of Pons's investigations (op. cit., pp. 272-4), though something could have been usefully added along the lines of Pons's discourse (pp. 308-17) on the origin and significance of the clothes philosophy in Swift's intellectual milieu. But the editors' general conclusion about the supposed sources of the *Tale* still holds good: the allegory 'had certainly been anticipated in part; but that it was consciously copied is questionable' (p. xxxi). It should be emphasized, nevertheless, that Swift was working over one of the most fully exploited domains of post-Reformation controversy. As I shall show in a forthcoming article, the most striking anticipation of the allegory of the *Tale* is to be found in the Reformation drama of Germany, where it appears as the main plot of the *Reformationsspiel* of Martin Rinckhart entitled *Der Eislebische Christliche Ritter*, published in 1613. In England the *Tale* was rooted deep in a long tradition of Puritan satire with which contemporary readers were well acquainted, and evidence of this could have been added to the otherwise full section on the allegory.

Additions to the annotations, other than textual variants, are neither numerous nor specially important. They include references to Bacon, to *Paradise Lost*, and to Ray's *Proverbs*, but do not take account of the additional correspondences with the scientific writings of the day that Miss Starkman has so instructively adduced in *Swift's Satire on Learning in 'A Tale of a Tub'* (Princeton, 1950). Swift's contempt for the popularizers of learning, notably that John Dunton whose *Athenian Gazette* he had once so inordinately praised, is worth another note or two. It is not Bentley and Wotton and learned men only that Swift has in view when he writes of 'the Sieves and Boulters of Learning' (p. 148). Dr. William King, the Civilian, also deserves fuller mention as one of the suspected authors of the *Tale*, and as an earlier satirist whose *Dialogues of the Dead* (1699) and *Transactioneer* (1700) may have provided Swift with some useful hints for his satire on Bentley, the virtuosos, and the new pedantry.

Though no longer an occasion for surprise, as it was to a reviewer in 1920, it remains a cause for continuing satisfaction that the editor has done his work 'with the reverence and precision which scholars commonly reserve for the text of the classics'.

COLIN J. HORNE

The Personality of Jonathan Swift. By IRVIN EHRENPREIS. Pp. 158. London: Methuen, 1958. 15s. net.

In course of time we are to expect from the author of this book a substantial biography of Jonathan Swift embodying years of scholarly and patient research. In this collection of essays on contrasted aspects of the Dean's life and character, vexed questions disputed by commentators from his day to ours, estimates in which he was held by distinguished men of his time, are reviewed with admirable good sense and studied judgement. False traditions concerning Swift have been many; careless misinterpretations have persisted.

Professor Ehrenpreis begins by disposing of divergent statements about Swift and women. 'Nobody had yet', he writes, 'remarked the amazing consistency which framed Swift's relations with women.' If the abrupt 'nobody' lies open to some qualification the word 'consistency' cannot be disputed. He was attached to several women during his life. The first may have been Betty Jones of Leicester. Writing a few months later his comment is that he will probably put off the thought of marriage 'to the other world'. The truth is that Swift found difficulty in an understanding of respect and continued friendship associated with sexual intercourse, or with detached independence of character. The early letters to Jane Waring (several are missing) reveal as much. Vanessa, passionate by nature, received disillusioning answers to her letters. Swift, it must be confessed, might have worded them more emphatically. Stella was by nature calm and poised. She may have hoped for a nearer relationship; but she learned to understand Swift's emotional unfitness for the married state. By him, however, her death was recorded in words of which it has been written, 'Sorrow and despair have many voices, but seldom have they found expression so affecting as in these calm and simple words.'

In the next chapter Mr. Ehrenpreis turns to consider the exaggerated attacks levelled at Swift by Thackeray, Aldous Huxley, George Orwell, Middleton Murry, and others, for obscenity and pre-occupation with filth and bodily decay; which bear a curious absence of conformity with truth if the measure of the writings which can be stigmatized as offensive be noted. The proportion is small; and his contemporaries regarded his personal habits as exceptionally clean. In treating of this subject Mr. Ehrenpreis examines minutely 'A Beautiful Young Nymph going to Bed' as representing Swift 'at his most damnable'. In the end he concludes, and justly, that many writers before and after Swift have written poems, or passages, which have been attacked for satirizing women's vices. If Swift, on occasion, succeeds in this genre more brilliantly than others 'let us admit it is traditions that shock us not the man'.

The chapter on *Gulliver* has aroused some dissent. It has commonly been accepted that Swift drew his background and characters from *The Memoirs of Martinus Scriblerus*, which, attributable largely to Pope and Arbuthnot, was designed to ridicule 'false tastes in learning'. As Spence (*Anecdotes*, p. 10) observes, 'There were pigmies in Schreiber's travels; and the projects of Laputa'. Mr. Ehrenpreis maintains that *Gulliver* does not take its origin from *Scriblerus*. During 1708-14 Swift put together essays and fragments dealing with English

politic
sembl
believ
in m
which
Brobd
voyage
philoso
creatu
regard
but if
Swift's
deavou
The
it seen
that hi
is that
of the
senile
exhibi
disting
good
and p

James
Duc
Pres
Pro
somet
activit
him as
sensib
in the
precoo
not hi
letters
Willia
which
Hill a
even t

The
have b
I had
which

politics. Gulliver in Lilliput is, he asserts, sketched from Bolingbroke. Resemblances, as a matter of fact, have always been noted. It is not so easy to believe that Swift in his character of the king of Brobdingnag had constantly in mind his early patron Sir William Temple, despite the reserve and aloofness which distinguished them both. Sir Walter Scott's suggestion that the king of Brobdingnag was drawn from William III is much less likely. In the fourth voyage, as Mr. Ehrenpreis sees it, the Houyhnhnms represent the deistic philosophers of Swift's day. 'Reason alone is sufficient to govern a rational creature', says Gulliver's Houyhnhnm master. The common belief that Swift regarded the Houyhnhnms as examples of moral perfection may be dismissed; but if they are to be regarded as a false ideal for man it is difficult to reconcile Swift's commentary in the final paragraphs of the fourth voyage with his endeavours to convert the Yahoos.

The popular belief that Swift in his last years sank into madness originated, it seems, from accounts written by Johnson and Sir Walter Scott; but evidence that his mind was diseased they do not produce. Nevertheless a common belief is that his life ended in lunacy, and even in fact that he was one of the first inmates of the hospital he founded. Actually he died in his deanery of that sad disease senile decay. The last two chapters of this work, 'Madness' and 'Old Age', exhibit the detailed annotation, good sense, and balanced judgement which distinguish the volume as a whole. This is a valuable book which disposes for good of misconceptions which have attached themselves for long to Swift's life and personality.

HAROLD WILLIAMS

James Thomson (1700-1748): Letters and Documents. Edited by ALAN DUGALD MCKILLOP. Pp. xii+226. Lawrence, Kansas: University of Kansas Press, 1958. \$5.00.

Professor McKillop has brought together a selection of letters mostly by but sometimes about Thomson, and a few other documents relevant to the life and activities of the poet, which together present a lively and intimate picture of him as a man, as a friend, as a lover, as a brother, as a man of letters and of sensibility, as a playwright and man of the theatre, and in general as a personality in the climate of his age. Many of the earlier letters suggest the work of a precocious and ambitious Scot trying his hand at an elegant style in a language not his own, rather as a bright schoolboy writes a Latin prose. The first of the letters written after his arrival in London from Scotland, to his old friend William Cranstoun, contains an exhibitionist exercise in dramatic criticism which is very like a clever undergraduate essay, and the early letters to Aaron Hill are studied pieces of formal compliment stylized to a degree not found in even the most self-conscious native-born English letter-writers of the time:

That great Mind, and transcendent Humanity, that appear in the Testimony you have been pleas'd to give my first Attempt, would have utterly confounded me, if I had not been prepar'd for such an Entertainment, by your well-known Character; which the voice of Fame, and your own masterly Writings, loudly proclaim.

Thomson and his fellow-Scot David Mallet exercised their elegant English in their mutual correspondence; Mr. McKillop records the deletion of 'godlike' and substitution of 'divine' in the following sentence in a letter of Thomson's to Mallet:

You think like Them too, your Bosom swells with the same divine Ambition, and would, if in the same Circumstances display the same heroic Vertues, that lye all glowing at your Heart.

The later letters show a greater command of English colloquial idiom, though he was always liable to employ a Scotticism in the heat of writing once his thoughts and emotions were allowed to range unfettered by stylistic self-consciousness. Compare, for example, this to Hill in October 1726, with the following extract from a letter to George Ross some ten years later:

(to Hill) . . . What unusual good Fortune has thus intitled me to your kind Regard? 'Tis nothing, sure, but your own generous Goodness, which, with your other many matchless Perfections, shall ever be my Love, and Wonder, while Truth and Harmony are the Objects of these Passions.

(to Ross) Having been intirely in the Country, of late, finishing my Play, I did not receive Your's till some Days ago. It was kind in you not to draw rashly upon me, which, at present, has put me in Danger; but very soon (That is to say about two Months hence) I shall have a golden Buckler, and you may draw boldly—May we hope to see you this Winter, and to have the Assistance of your Hands, in Case it is acted?

Thomson's letters show much more clearly than those of, say, Arbuthnot, the problems of style and vocabulary facing a Scot who sought acceptance in the Augustan literary world. Mr. McKillop is (understandably) not interested in this aspect of the letters he prints, and he does not always notice the Scotticisms nor, when he does notice them, does he always comment on them most happily. Of Thomson's use of the word 'bypast' in the phrase 'this tedious, bypast summer' he notes that it is 'a Scots word, though not so entered in the dictionaries'. He might have looked the word up and found it in James Beattie's *Scotticisms, arranged in Alphabetical Order, designed to correct Improprieties of Speech and Writing*, which, though not published until 1787, reflects very accurately Scottish speech habits of the earlier eighteenth century as well as the later and is indeed of the first importance in determining differences between the speech of educated Scotsmen and Englishmen in the whole period between Ramsay and Burns. Again, Mr. McKillop somewhat coyly explains 'mow' as 'apparently a Scots word, the kind that does not get into the dictionaries'. There is no 'apparently' about it: the finest of all Burns's bawdy poems, and one of the best songs in *The Merry Muses of Caledonia*, is the rollicking 'When Princes and Prelates' or 'Poor bodies hae naething but mow', where the word in question is used as the final rhyme-word in each of the nine stanzas and chorus.

The controlled ecstasies of Thomson's more formal letters about Nature or poetry or the passions are sometimes interspersed with personal comments of a very different tone, which seems to show some uncertainty in command of conversational tone that can produce bathos:

There is downright inspiration in your Society: It enlarges and exalts all the Powers of the Soul, chases every low Thought, throws the Passions into the most agreeable Agitations, and gives the Heart the most affecting Sentiments—"Tis moral Harmony!

It gives me an additional Pleasure, to reflect how justly pleas'd, too, Mr. Savage was.

The letters to Mallet and others show interestingly the development of Thomson's sense of the picturesque and its relation to melancholy and moral feeling. He calls a description by Mallet of the wailing owl screaming solitary in the night wind 'charmingly dreary' and refers in admiration to the 'dismal Simplicity' of another couplet. In a later letter to Mallet he praises a line as 'a very full, natural, dismal Picture'. He adds: 'I am not only chill'd, but shiver at the Sight.' Of another passage, which leads him to comment 'Shreiking Witches—in the Desart—[*terrible!* deleted] at the Dead of Night—terrible!' he concludes: 'This is Poetry! this is arousing Fancy! Enthusiasm! Rapturous Terror! can't you get another Epithete for Night—Evening—in her brown Mantle wrapt—I am not afraid of your finding out as good a one.'

There is a long letter to Lady Hertford containing much of the thought in Part I of *Liberty*. There are many letters containing illuminating references to Thomson's theatrical ventures. There are numerous confessions of his own indolence and laziness, which seem often to have led him to postpone answering letters to the point where he had to defend himself from the reproach of discourtesy or cooling friendship. In the last of Thomson's letters printed, to William Paterson, he remarks: 'you know me well enough to account for my Silence, without my saying any more upon that Head.' To his sister Jean he more than once had to protest that his silence meant no loss of love: 'I thought you had known me better than to interpret my Silence into a Decay of Affection, . . . Dont imagine, because I am a bad Correspondent, that I can ever prove an unkind Friend and Brother.' Viscount Barrington, in a letter to Mallet part of which is here printed, remarked: 'There is but one Man in England more Indolent than my self & that is Thompson.' The ten letters to Elizabeth Young—Thomson's 'lov'd Amanda'—tell the story of his unsuccessful pursuit of Miss Young with a genuinely moving eloquence. Most attractive of all are Thomson's letters to Solomon Mendez, the London Jewish merchant with whom he seems to have been on terms of affectionate intimacy. The relationship revealed should be of interest to historians of Anglo-Jewry; the letters show an ease in friendly teasing on religious matters that argues the highest degree both of true toleration and of mutual respect and friendship. He is apologizing, as so often, for his indolence in not writing:

. . . My silence, I do assure you, was altogether unleavened; as unleavened as the cakes which you sent me, and for which I thank you. They were extremely good: and if the children of Israel had such good bread in Egypt, besides the flesh-pots we read of, they were not so wise as they have been ever since, for having left it. However that be, I ate them with great devotion; not, indeed, in my shoes, with my loins girt, and my staff in my hand; but in my slippers, my night-gown, and easy

chair. But (as Savage would say) to *passover* this, I propose to myself the pleasure of waiting on you soon, nor will I then leave you for two three days . . .

Mr. McKillop has, with his usual careful scholarship, produced a book which genuinely illuminates both Thomson and his times. We might, however, have been spared transcripts of tedious assignments of copyright of Thomson's works: they might have been profitably exchanged for a table of contents.

DAVID DAICHES

Doctor Johnson and Others. By S. C. ROBERTS. Pp. viii + 176. Cambridge: University Press, 1958. 18s. 6d. net.

This agreeable little book contains essays and addresses by the former Master of Pembroke, written between 1944 and 1957. A third of the book concerns Johnson, and references to him are frequent elsewhere. In his Preface Sir Sydney refers to, and in his opening essay on Thomas Fuller he quotes, Johnson's ' . . . the biographical part of literature is what I love most'—a love he clearly shares. In Johnson, however, the biographical and the critical interests and talents were more equal; Sir Sydney's element is biography, and he is apt to turn aside from critical discussion with such a comment as this, on a pleasant skit by Max Beerbohm: 'Such a piece, as Johnson said of Gray's *Elegy*, it is useless to praise.' Johnson was more articulate and analytical, on the *Elegy* and elsewhere, than this suggests.

The most substantial item is Sir Sydney's British Academy lecture on Johnson the Moralist. For many of his contemporaries, we are reminded, 'Johnson was primarily the majestic exponent of ethical wisdom', and there follows an excellent illustration of how this wisdom is manifested in Johnson the poet, the lexicographer, the essayist, and the critic. Sir Sydney corrects some common misunderstandings of Johnson's politics, as (in the following essay) he clarifies Johnson's position as Christian and Churchman. These are well-argued assessments, moving adroitly between Johnson's writings and his conversations. The other major Johnsonian piece, 'The Biographer', is disappointing; it concerns only the earlier 'Lives', up to that of Savage in 1744, and though it usefully reminds us of some characteristic but unfamiliar passages it adds little to what any reader must have noticed for himself.

The lecture on Fuller is concerned with presenting him as more than an anthologist's treasury of quaintness; Sir Sydney agrees with Saintsbury that no one should think he understands Fuller without reading at least one of his books *in toto*. Unable to pass this test, I merely record that the lecture exemplifies gifts and interests apparent elsewhere in the collection—its author's relish for character, his felicity in quoting, and his eye for details of University history. His W. P. Ker lecture, 'Thomas Gray of Pembroke', is already familiar, particularly for its demonstration that 'the personnel of an eighteenth-century high table changed much more rapidly than in later times and whatever may have been the shortcomings of the Fellows, senility was not one of them'. Benjamin

Beats
Beats
of th
engag
he ha
of the
clergy
comic
note
histor
Th
degre
are s
Sydn
his se
pract
Priv
publi
R. W
'discr
whic
confir
by P
the d
trust
ough
Paper
Th
comm
capit
polic
137';
p. 78,
p. 12

The
Cla
Th
which
it ver
schol
letter
did n

Beatson, a later Fellow of Pembroke (1827-74), is the subject of another paper. Beatson seems a dull dog, but his early diaries provide some interesting details of the daily routine of schoolboys and undergraduates around 1820. Meals engaged much of his interest, and 'Like all undergraduates of all generations, he had a low opinion of the Hall dinner', strike-action being already the resource of the exasperated: 'Men conspired to eat no pies till meat be better.' Another clergyman-don discussed is James Beresford of Merton, author of a popular comic book of its day, *The Miseries of Human Life* (1806). This is a stimulating note on an idiosyncratic man, who has surprisingly been overlooked by the local historians of Leicestershire, where he held a living in his later years.

The essay on Pepys and Boswell discriminates nicely between their respective degrees of vanity, amorousness, and frankness; some illuminating comparisons are suggested. Two remarks about Boswell may, however, be queried. Sir Sydney quotes as 'characteristically Boswellian' some instances of his confessing his sexual misadventures to his 'valuable spouse', but this was not his general practice. More important is the assertion about Boswell's huge collection of Private Papers: '... however intimate, it was all to be available some day for publication'. Boswell's intentions in this matter remain controversial, but Dr. R. W. Chapman's surmise (in *Essays and Studies*, 1932), that his executors' 'discretionary power to publish more or less' referred only to the papers on which the then-unpublished *Tour* and *Life* were based, seems to have been confirmed by the Codicil of December 1785, recently discovered and discussed by Professor Pottle. There, Boswell specifically instructed Malone that from the diaries 'a variety of passages concerning Dr. Johnson may be excerpted. I trust that he will not divulge anything he may find in the said volumes which ought to be concealed.' This Codicil is printed in the 'History of the Boswell Papers', in the *de luxe* edition only of the *London Journal* 1762-3.

There are a number of misprints and errors of transcription; in the quotations, commas are often dropped, semicolons reduced to commas, and the original capitalization and italics reproduced spasmodically; there seems no consistent policy. The more important misprints are: p. 49, 'Rambler 145' should be 'Rambler 137'; p. 53, l. 19, 'that' should be omitted; p. 68, l. 13, 'pleasure' is misprinted; p. 78, l. 3, 'to be' is omitted after 'glad'; p. 92, l. 20, 'riches' should be 'affluence'; p. 128, l. 18, 'here' should be 'there'; p. 146, l. 27, '360' should be '380'.

P. A. W. COLLINS

The History of Fanny Burney. By JOYCE HEMLOW. Pp. xvi+528. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958. 35s. net.

The clever, affectionate, scribbling Burneys lived in a cloud of manuscripts, which were so much an externalization of their joint family life that they found it very difficult to destroy any of them. Besides the material for Dr. Burney's scholarly work and the novels and plays of his daughters, there was a deposit of letters and journals on an immense scale. Mme d'Arblay records that her father did not even destroy an invitation to dinner. Death alone forced the reduction

of this body of familiar evidence, the care for the posthumous reputation of the deceased and the fear of making mischief and causing pain among the survivors. A great deal remained intact. Professor Hemlow prints over six pages of a 'tentative summary' of the location and nature of the existing Burney hoards, and some of them are very large. The largest has descended through the family of Mme d'Arblay's niece, Charlotte Barrett, and it is only within this generation that it has passed into public ownership, partly in the Berg Collection of the New York Public Library and partly in the British Museum. Another substantial section, consisting chiefly of Dr. Burney's papers and correspondence, is to be found in the Osborn Collection of Yale University, and there are smaller blocks in public and private ownership from King's Lynn to California.

The top cream of Mme d'Arblay's bequest—and very rich and thick it was—was taken off by her niece in the *Diary and Letters of Madame d'Arblay* (1842-6) and by Annie Raine Ellis in *The Early Diary of Frances Burney* (1889). Miss Hemlow has done wisely in reserving her space chiefly for quotation from the unpublished parts of these and other deposits; but it follows that, though there are fresh scraps about Dr. Johnson and the Thrale circle, of which we can never have too much, and pleasing evidence of Mme d'Arblay's continued friendship with the Royal Princesses whom she had served, there is no large body of what may be called public material in her book. This is the history of a private family; and to assemble it she has ranged widely and turned over many thousands of leaves, and no praise is too high for her diligent, courageous, scrupulous, and loving scholarship.

Unless we are to assume that the Burney archives, like Mount Everest, being there must be tackled, we must ask what the fruit of this elaborate project is. Fanny Burney—to recur to her more familiar name—holds a modest and permanent place in the history of the English novel. Miss Austen's train have no need to defend their favourite against the incursions of the Burneyites. Her talents were of a different order, and we all know it. Fanny Burney, however, had talents too, genuine and spontaneous ones. They consisted of a keen observation, a lively mimetic gift, and a superb memory. These were in the service of an anxious and finicking concern with morals and manners, within the framework of contemporary social life, and of the kind of robust, unsubtle humour which presumes the ready laughter of a like-minded group. 'Transcription' is the word that occurs in the praises of her admirers. She provides us with a series of types and conversation-pieces, somewhat prolonged in the exhibition—the fault of the 'transcriber'—but so up to date and comically realistic that a figure like the retired tradesman, Hobson, in *Cecilia* was acclaimed as a 'portrait of *exact* nature . . . represented to the life'. Miss Hemlow does not at all exaggerate the qualities of the novels. She has her own line on them, and points out how they fulfil the functions of conduct-books, pleasantly calling the fastidious lover in *Camilla* a 'conduct-meter'. Such minor but genuine talents, whose proper expression is distorted by laborious acquisitions and docile concessions, are very open to stale generalizations, the more so if they stand at the budding-off of a subsection of the form they practise, and cannot be left alone to survive in the pleasure of their few readers. It is good, then,

that we should be made to freshen our response to them through a biographical approach.

Dr. Burney's daughter could not, by taking thought, add a cubit to her stature as a novelist, and in her solicitude to live up to the expectations of her father and her friends, to meet the tastes of a social group a little above her origin, to avoid the slightest tincture of the unladylike or the morally reprehensible, she took a great deal of thought. Her four novels, nevertheless, progress on a declining plane, though perhaps *Cecilia* has not yet received the recognition it merits for its relevant construction—a rare merit in the eighties. This is the common view, and it is just. What is interesting is the complexity of fact and feeling that lies behind the sequence. Dr. Burney, the villain of the piece, is not wholly responsible. The manuscript of *Evelina* establishes that already the first and most spontaneous of her books, incubated in happy secrecy, had been subjected to elegant revision. The girlish informality of the manuscript version is brushed and combed for public appearance in the printed book. She was miserably anxious over *Cecilia*, wrenched out of her cherished 'snugship', urged on by her friends, terrified of failing to sustain the standard of *Evelina* and provoking the cruel lampoons of the time. Under these constraints, the free movement stiffened. 'I don't write as I did', she notes depressedly. There was a further injury to her self-confidence when her father and 'Daddy' Crisp discouraged her satire on the Blues as ill-advised. Yet spontaneity, when it was regained, did not restore her to her proper vein. The tragedies she wrote to solace her unhappy life as Second Keeper of the Robes were quite spontaneous and all very bad. She wrote *Camilla* for money, to support her courageous marriage, and in her happy little household the sense of well-being in writing returned. 'It is so delicious to stride on, *en vers*', she wrote to her husband. But *Camilla* is a further decline from *Cecilia*, heavier in handling, and based, as Miss Hemlow points out, more on memory than on observation. Her belated fourth novel, *The Wanderer*, won no praise. Its social scenes were out of date, its moral preoccupation and elaborate rigidity of style repellent. Yet Hazlitt could say that it witnessed 'no decay of talent, but a perversion of it', and her vivid, easy letters, up to the end of her long life, confirm the witness. It is a complex graph to plot. Her talent was for the realistic and satiric, and needed to be nourished by continual observation; for its exercise, her temperament required shelter and warmth and some measure of irresponsibility. When one or more of these conditions failed, she sought safety within the accepted moral and literary codes of her youth, and acquired an armoured and bedizened decency that she could never afterwards discard in public. There was a grievous waste of talent. In her excuse it must be remembered that to be a writing woman was a situation of extreme exposure.

Fanny Burney's history is inwoven in this book, as in her life, with the fates of her family. It is here that we seem to reach one of the differences between masculine and feminine taste. Towards the end of most of the reviews by male critics there has been audible a mutter of irritation. 'All this fiddle-faddle about Susans and Sarahs', is what it means; or 'What imports the nomination of this lady?' What is it, then, that keeps the female reviewer absorbed to the last

Marianne? It cannot be without significance that the three notable feminine talents of this period, Miss Burney, Miss Edgeworth, and Miss Austen, were all family women, units of a group, in whom the thread of life was inextricably twined with other threads, issuing from the same cradle. They lived in a constant reciprocation of affection and criticism with their closest relations, and were freely exercised in their original womanly qualities. This state has been censured as 'family fixation', and the danger is underlined in the Burney documents by Fanny's use of the language of sensibility. It cannot, however, have hurt her much. She established her own household, kept the ties with all the others in her hand and the letters in her boxes, and preserved in her troubles a stability that a detached woman often finds it difficult to maintain. We cannot excise Susan from the novelist's life, for Susan was an intrinsic part of Fanny's being. We feel an interest more intimate than that evoked by an example of social history as we watch the whole family group moving on in time, suffering truncation and dispersal, acquiring new members with different ideas (such as Fanny's Evangelical nieces) but still bound together by shared experience. This is the substance, under the conditions of art and of a keener, more poetic, more profoundly melancholy intellect, of Virginia Woolf's *The Years*. On the last page of that book, the group of old brothers and sisters, standing together in the window after a party, watching the London dawn, is said to have a 'statuesque air'. The units of it, we know, are sliding to dissolution, but in this momentary grace and harmony there is conveyed the hardly definable beauty of ordinary human relations prolonged through life. At the end of Miss Hemlow's book the group has dissolved. Only the two old sisters, Fanny and Charlotte, are left, and in the exchanges between them, after the death of Fanny's only son, we have an unsparing honesty and justified trust, greater as a human achievement than *Evelina*. Lastly there is old Mme d'Arblay alone at eighty-seven, with all her memories folded in her mind and inscribed on the ancient leaves that are now at our disposal.

J. M. S. TOMPKINS

Englische Vorromantik und deutscher Sturm und Drang. M. G. Lewis' Stellung in der Geschichte der deutsch-englischen Literaturbeziehungen. By KARL S. GUTHKE. Pp. 232 (*Palaestra* 223). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1958. DM. 24.80.

As its title implies, Dr. Guthke's book has relevance for more than one field of studies. Not only is it a scholarly examination of 'Monk' Lewis's major achievement, the translation and adaptation of contemporary German literature; it is also a serious and open-minded attempt to reassess Lewis's ambiguous position in the stream of English literary history, and to illuminate, in an original way, the contribution of Germany to English developments.

Both the wide range of Dr. Guthke's subject and the nature of his approach to it are revealed at once by the technical framework of his book. A foreword states the aims and values of the investigation which is to follow; a detailed list of contents does much to clarify in advance the complex material involved;

and appended is a select, but internationally useful, bibliography—from which, however, L. M. Price's standard works on the literary relations of England and Germany are surprisingly absent. The bibliography alone clearly indicates the scope of Dr. Guthke's interests, touching as it does on aspects of Lewis research, Anglo-German contacts, the Gothic Revival, as well as on contemporary German literary traditions and figures.

Within this framework the material is presented logically and cumulatively. In an opening chapter, devoted to the German origins and English repercussions of *The Monk*, Dr. Guthke, for the first time, points to Lewis's real significance as the champion in England of the German movement of Storm and Stress. Lewis's actual acquaintance with Germany is then examined systematically, first in a chapter on his literary experiences and formative contacts in Weimar and then in a series of chapters on his associations with major and minor German authors. C. M. Wieland, Kotzebue, Klinger, Kleist, Goethe, Herder, Schiller, Musäus, Naubert, and Zschokke are shown to have provided Lewis with material or stimulus for his work of translation and adaptation. Moreover, his characteristic derivative manner is demonstrated by penetrating stylistic comparisons of his English versions and their German counterparts. Thus Dr. Guthke links, for example, Lewis's *Rolla* with Kotzebue's *Die Spanier in Peru*, *Amorassan* with Klinger's *Der Faust der Morgenländer*, *Mistrust* with Kleist's *Die Familie Schroffenstein*, in such a way as to reveal Lewis's taste in choosing material for translation and the nature of his ability as a translator. Possibly the most subtly handled chapters are those which deal with Lewis's adaptation of the ballads of Herder and Goethe. Here Dr. Guthke shows unusual understanding of folksong style and of the problems of its conscious imitation, as well as insight into the doubtful value of Lewis's excursion into the genre of the literary ballad.

In his last chapter Dr. Guthke abandons his analytical technique and collects and evaluates the various problems and conclusions which have emerged. He indicates the range and depth of Lewis's acquaintance with German language and literature; assesses the quality of his translation—unusually subtle when compared with the standards of his day; attributes to him the influential introduction into English literature of Storm and Stress characteristics; traces back to his work and its German origins the English Romantic attitude of belief in a real supernatural world. From this Dr. Guthke concludes that, thanks to Lewis, and contrary to popular opinion, Germany's period of Storm and Stress made a positive contribution to the English development out of Enlightenment and towards Romanticism.

If Dr. Guthke's book is valuable by reason of its conclusions and its various implications for comparative literature, it is also significant in its method. This is indeed a rare work of German scholarship, avoiding as it does the typical pitfalls of over-abstractness and turgidity of style, unfounded generalization and an exclusively philosophical approach. Admittedly, Dr. Guthke pays homage to German traditions of thematic examination and 'Geistesgeschichte'; and, as a result of the mass of evidence adduced and the technical awkwardness of dealing in two languages, his book is slow and heavy to read. Nevertheless, it is unusually

satisfying in its conformity to English academic standards of clarity, accuracy, and factual precision. The many typographical slips are the more regrettable in view of Dr. Guthke's obviously skilful handling of problems of presentation. In general, his characteristic quality is prudence. He consistently refuses to generalize or speculate but, guided by textual or autobiographical evidence, steers an accurate path between over-enthusiasm and cynicism and consequently produces an authoritative and balanced evaluation of both Lewis's work and the relevant secondary sources.

GILLIAN RODGER

The Early Wordsworthian Milieu. A Notebook of Christopher Wordsworth with a few Entries by William Wordsworth. Edited by Z. S. FINK. Pp. xii+156. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1958. 25s. net.

The notebook here presented consists of twenty pages and three loose leaves, written in the hands indicated by the subtitle. It is introduced by a leisurely essay of seventy-three pages and followed by a generous commentary. The entries by William Wordsworth seem to be mainly jottings for a work in the Gothic tradition; Professor Fink connects them with Helen Maria Williams's *Edwin and Eltruda* and would date them 1784-5. The entries by Christopher Wordsworth are much more numerous and, for Mr. Fink's purpose, more important. They consist almost entirely of notes for a Latin poem describing the Lake District of which a fuller and more coherent outline appears in B.M. Add. MS. 46136, printed in Mr. Fink's Appendix. They record things seen and where to see them, Lake District tradition and custom, and references to many prospective sources for the poem in Latin and English literature, including English guide-book material in the picturesque tradition. These entries are dated 1789-91.

Mr. Fink's introduction is not, of course, concerned with the conventional pastiche which would have emerged, but with the relation between Christopher's entries, both their original matter and their references to other writers, and the works of William Wordsworth. He explains the connexions as a result of 'their common school environment and similarities of temperament' and of 'a common literary store' (p. 14); and conjectures, more riskily, that the brothers 'may have worked together or echoed each other' on the basis of personal contact in 1788 and 1789 and of correspondence in later years (pp. 17-18). The major part of the essay deals in some detail with *The Vale of Esthwaite*, *An Evening Walk*, *Descriptive Sketches*, and *The Prelude*, and more briefly with *Guilt and Sorrow*, *The Borderers*, the lyrics, and the *Guide to the Lakes*.

In 1815 Wordsworth saw fit to announce to a hostile 'Public' that he was an original genius. This legend, no doubt because it contains more than a modicum of truth, dies hard; but with the aid of de Selincourt's and Miss Darbishire's edition of the poems, and of some more recent studies, we are now in a better position to see in what sense it is true. Mr. Fink's essay improves our perspective, especially upon Wordsworth's rider that 'the predecessors of an original Genius ... will have smoothed the way for all that he has in common with them'. Much

of the subject-matter of the early topographical poems can be found, through Christopher's notes, in the eighteenth-century guide-books. Wordsworth's treatment of it is often highly conventional, and sometimes he must have merely versified guide-book material or local legend which the guide-books report, such as the account of the spectral horsemen in *An Evening Walk*, 179 ff. In other instances, the material, whether recorded in guide-books or not, was open to his observation. In both cases, Mr. Fink shows, with varying degrees of conviction, that the material has a foundation in real things such as the mature poet's verse rarely lacked. Wordsworth's response to them in these early works is shaped by eighteenth-century tradition, but the factual basis remains. Thus the horrific details of *The Vale of Esthwaite* are, we learn, his response, conditioned by the Gothic tradition, to local legend connected with a genuine ancient mansion of the neighbourhood. That the same legend supplied the basis for the tale of the grasping landowner in *Guilt and Sorrow* seems less certain, since the theme, as Mr. Fink admits (p. 50), and no doubt the kind of event concerned, were common in the later eighteenth century.

The more original side of Wordsworth's genius, rightly found by Mr. Fink in several passages of *An Evening Walk*, is best seen in his account of *The Prelude*, where the conventional material of guide-book and eighteenth-century topographical poem, enriched by personal experience, appears transmuted by the Wordsworthian imagination. 'Tradition', Mr. Fink comments, 'emerges even in the midst of newness and variety' (p. 63).

Apart from an understandable eagerness to connect as much of Wordsworth's verse as he can with the material in the notebook, there seems little to criticize in Mr. Fink's essay. He might have cited some specific examples of conventional eighteenth-century poems on memory (pp. 56-57). His suggestion that 'similarities of phrasing in Dorothy's *Journal* are so far from representing sources of [a] poem as to be instead reflections of the materials of which it was made' (p. 66, cf. p. 28) has been advanced before; the notebook entry on daffodils offers confirmation.

The spelling of the text 'is that of the entries without editorial alteration' (p. 74), but the results occasionally raise doubts on the wisdom of this conservatism. By 'quaking' (p. 76) the writer presumably meant 'quacking', and here, where the word printed makes a kind of sense, we should suspect faulty transcription were it not that Mr. Fink reproduces the page as his frontispiece. There is no such check on p. 88, where 'as the ardently wished' leaves us in doubt whether the writer intended 'they' or whether a noun has dropped out of manuscript or print. At 'stra[i]n' (p. 83) and 'Lear[n]ing' (p. 93) we can guess; but should we have to guess? The last word on p. 76, printed 'Comb', does not look like it in the facsimile. Two references (pp. 14, 127) to a non-existent third volume of Knight's edition of Wordsworth's prose should be to vol. ii.

W. J. B. OWEN

The English Romantic Poets and Essayists. By NORTHROP FRYE and others. Edited by C. W. and L. H. HOUTCHENS. Pp. xii+364. New York: Modern Language Association of America, 1957; London: Oxford University Press, 1958. 32s. net.

Those who have consulted *The English Romantic Poets*, the survey of research and criticism which Mr. T. M. Raysor edited some years ago, will welcome this companion volume dealing with Blake, Lamb, Hazlitt, Walter Scott, Southey, Campbell, Moore, Landor, Leigh Hunt, and De Quincey. Simply as a bibliography it is often invaluable. Thus, Mr. Kenneth Curry's list of books containing letters by Southey is the fullest that has yet been published. But besides this, each chapter is a personal evaluation by a scholar whose opinion must carry weight with any student in this field. Indeed, the only criticism one can make of the present work is that on occasion more discussion of issues raised by books and articles would have been welcome. Some of the chapters, such as Miss Elisabeth Schneider's on Hazlitt and Mr. R. H. Super's on Landor, are so good in this way that they probably make the reader expect greater detail elsewhere than he is entitled to. None the less, something more might have been done to illustrate (for example) the kind of interest that scholars have found in Lamb's literary criticism. We are told that Mr. W. E. Houghton vindicates the acuteness and validity of the 'Artificial Comedy' essay; but, in view of Mr. Wellek's 'coolness' noted later, it would have been worth mentioning Mr. Houghton's emphasis on the way Lamb wrote from his own sensitive experience in the theatre, from his own reactions to different actors' interpretations of the same character. Mr. Stuart M. Tave, who contributes this section (the bibliographical and biographical sections are by Mr. George L. Barnett), gives, however, an excellent general account of Lamb's appreciators and depreciators, and makes some particularly interesting suggestions about where further work on Lamb would be profitable.

Some people will read Mr. Northrop Frye's account of Blake studies with strong disagreement; but even those whom he thinks guilty of 'persistent exaggeration of the esoteric elements in Blake's thought' will probably acknowledge that Mr. Frye's approach is a useful one for a survey of scholarship. As he remarks:

The responsible student of English literature, even the eighteenth-century or romantic specialist, confronted with the weighty commentaries that are still essential, is likely to feel that Blake is a special interest, to be taken up like chess by those who fancy it.

Mr. Frye's chapter, based firmly on the view that Blake was a Bible-soaked middle-class English Protestant, is as persuasive an invitation to the study of Blake as anyone has written.

Perhaps the most difficult task in this volume was given to Mr. James T. Hillhouse, who contributes the chapter on Walter Scott. He has to select from an overwhelming quantity of material, and to allow for a great variety of opinion about Scott's status. At the present time, the purely literary critics like him least, but there seems to be much scope for work like that done by Mr. Duncan Forbes

on Scott as a product of eighteenth-century 'philosophical history', which may prepare the way for a more favourable critical reassessment. Mr. Hillhouse does not mention something which bears on this, the fact that Marxist critics seem more sympathetic to Scott than their bourgeois colleagues. Mr. Arnold Kettle's discussion of *The Heart of Midlothian* (in his *Introduction to the English Novel*) shows a fine appreciation of Scott's delight in the encounter of characters who live within different sets of assumptions, of his ability to single out a significant event involving clashes of opposing cultures. Mr. György Lukács is even more favourably disposed. The long and enthusiastic chapter on Scott in his study of the historical novel reinforces some of the points made by Mr. Forbes.

A book like this is bound to draw attention to many more issues than can even be hinted at in a review. Two matters may be mentioned in conclusion. First, one problem which still faces scholars in this field is the tracking down of manuscripts. The editors, in their chapter on Leigh Hunt, indicate the wide distribution of his manuscript letters. Mr. John E. Jordan remarks that much remains to be done in the listing of De Quincey's papers, and the same is true, though not quite to the same extent, of Southey. (The latter deficiency will be met when Mr. Curry's edition of Southey's unpublished letters is printed.) The other point concerns studies of the relationship between politics and literature. Such studies are of particular importance for students of early nineteenth-century literature, but there is obviously still much room for thorough research. Mr. Hoover H. Jordan makes clear that Moore deserves more careful treatment as a political writer. Were his satires effective? 'No one has a well-documented answer despite strong expression of opinion.' Most surprising of all is Miss Schneider's observation that Hazlitt's political writings as a whole—'their range of ideas, their scope, method, and style, their antecedents, their influence, and much else—still await full and authoritative treatment'.

GEOFFREY CARNALL

The Romantic Assertion. By R. A. FOAKES. Pp. 186. London: Methuen; New Haven: Yale University Press, 1958. 16s. net.

It has been apparent for some time, though it has not always been admitted, that the dominant modern critical methods leave fairly large areas of poetry either unvalued or undervalued. Among these are poems which seem too bald and innocent for close analysis (e.g. the shorter poems of Wordsworth and Tennyson), poems whose very life consists in the isolable and quite unironic statements they make (e.g. most of Burns), and poems whose emotional impetus rides home triumphantly on some ill-constructed mount (e.g. in Shelley). Mr. Foakes's short but interesting book is an attempt to restore something of a balance, by offering a new approach to the poetry of the Romantic period.

The author argues that the modern critic's interest in metaphor (as opposed to simile and description), in irony, in conflict, and in intellectuality, leaves him

very much at a loss when he considers Romantic poetry, which works in a different but not less valid way. Instead of 'images of thought' such as we find in the Metaphysicals, 'images of impression' are used by the Romantics. Instead of a complex play of ironies, there is an open 'vocabulary of assertion'. Instead of valuing stress and conflict, these poets are proclaiming 'a principle of order and permanence in the universe'. Mr. Foakes uses the term 'image of impression' to denote the descriptive word-picture where any analogy depends not on ingenious originality or wit but on a natural and lasting correspondence. In its extreme form this kind of image becomes all vehicle and no tenor: an unstated allegory, where any deeper meaning must be guessed behind the descriptive façade. (Mr. Foakes quotes William Blake's 'The Sick Rose'; perhaps the process is clearer in Robert Frost's 'Stopping by Woods on a Snowy Evening' or in Bertolt Brecht's 'Der Pflaumenbaum'.) It is from these simple, elemental, yet reverberant images of impression (light and darkness, city and desert, sea and mountain), acting in conjunction with broader 'structural images' (life as a journey, human love as a type of union and harmony) and with a series of abstract value-words (beauty, liberty, truth, sympathy, power, grace, sublime) that the characteristic effects of Romantic poetry are built up.

There is little here that one would quarrel with, though an analytic critic would want to know more about the relation between these contributory elements, which can evidently produce a trite, pompous, rhetorical poetry as well as a poetry of genuine nobility and aspiration. But when Mr. Foakes goes on to identify the main Romantic preoccupation as asserting some 'principle of order' to replace the old microcosm-macrocosm world-view that had gone with the seventeenth century, this would seem to be giving a special boost to the 'Romantic assertion' at the expense of the even more significant Romantic longing for revolution, turbulence, liberation, strangeness, and indeed an escape from order. The thrilling, dangerous Romanticism of Byron, Leopardi, and Lermontov seems to find little echo in Mr. Foakes's somewhat too neat and defensive conception of the movement. Byron, who is referred to in passing but not discussed, seems a curious omission, and his absence is felt at many points. When the author comments on Matthew Arnold's 'peculiar, wistful attitude towards the Romantic poets', these are surely the wrong terms in which to portray the Arnold who in 'Haworth Churchyard' praised Emily Brontë for her passion and daring unequalled since the death of Byron, 'that world-famed son of fire'.

In the illustrative essays on selected nineteenth-century poems (Wordsworth's *The Prelude*, Keats's *The Eve of St. Agnes*, Shelley's *Adonais*, Tennyson's *In Memoriam*, Browning's *Men and Women*, Arnold's poems, and James Thomson's *The City of Dreadful Night*), Mr. Foakes traces what he regards as the gradual disintegration of the Romantic vision into a largely unconvincing rhetoric of assertion in Tennyson and Browning, and finally, in James Thomson, into a complete inversion of the Romantic message, which nevertheless has its power and deals with the important modern theme of the city. These essays are rather slight, after the deployment of critical ideas in the first three chapters, and the general thesis of the book would have gained strength from a fuller examination of a wider range of poems and poets (including, perhaps, the difficult example of

Hopki
survey
out fre
ism ha
hearte
which
resour

Thack
+52

Prof
with T
true, t
the re
Mr. R
charge
Thack
'The C
has gro
abund
The p
his qu

In t
withou
a celeb
that o
and o
any m
recogn
Cornh
unmix
writin
aware
old ag

The
reputa
Thack
War,
from
in all
Thack
all, th
Charl

Hopkins). But as the author says in his Preface, his aim was 'not an exhaustive survey, but an exploratory study', and his book succeeds admirably in sketching out fresh lines of approach to certain kinds of great poetry which modern criticism has on the whole been powerless to evaluate. One can only agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Foakes in his dissatisfaction with a critical régime under which 'a poet is more likely . . . to be disapproved for failing to exploit the full resources of words than for having nothing urgent to say'.

EDWIN MORGAN

Thackeray: The Age of Wisdom. 1847-1863. By GORDON N. RAY. Pp. xvi + 526. London: Oxford University Press, 1958. 55s. net.

Professor Ray's second volume has the admirable rightness of touch in dealing with Thackeray's life that distinguished its predecessor. He presents, it is true, the case for Thackeray, but in the unravelling of such tangled affairs as the relationship with Mrs. Brookfield or the quarrel with Edmund Yates, Mr. Ray shows the impartiality and exactitude of a public servant who has been charged with ascertaining the facts, and making his report. This report on Thackeray becomes indirectly a report on his age, and chapters such as that on 'The Great World' could not be bettered. Victorian scholarship in recent years has grown to maturity. Mr. Ray's book is clearly a major contribution, with its abundance of precise detail, and the many side-lights refracted from its pages. The problem of Thackeray's importance as a writer still remains with us. About his quality as a man, now, I take it, our minds can be made up.

In the years chronicled here and described as 'The Age of Wisdom', not without a sense of Thackeray's possible amusement at the title, Mr. Ray depicts a celebrity to whom all doors are open, even, it at one moment seems to Thackeray, that of the House of Commons. Thackeray is transformed into a public figure, and once he has presented the world with Colonel Newcome, nobody doubts any more that his heart is in the right place. He is a presence and a power, recognized as such, for example, by Matthew Arnold; and as editor of the *Cornhill* he finds himself very prosperous. They are not, however, years of unmixed triumph: Thackeray's melancholy is very distinctly marked in his writings, with its roots partly in 'longing passion unfulfilled', partly in his awareness of failure to replenish his imagination. Thackeray died before reaching old age, but he had nothing more, one feels, to expect.

There is a gradual change in his attitudes, well traced by Mr. Ray. The reputation of being a radical still lingered, and it flared up for a while when Thackeray, exasperated like Dickens by the criminal blunders of the Crimean War, championed the Administrative Reform Association. The estrangement from Dickens, brought to a head in the Garrick Club affair, when Dickens threw in all his weight with Edmund Yates and the Bohemians, was no doubt inevitable. Thackeray had been drawn willingly enough into Whig circles; he was, after all, the 'swell' who had come back to his rightful place; Dickens, Ruskin, Charlotte Brontë, and Tennyson, as Mr. Ray reminds us, 'made the experiment

of London society and retired from it unhappy'. Thackeray was merely 'returning to the social sphere of his youth after fifteen years of exile'. The gentleman in him came gradually to suppress the Bohemian.

In one chapter Mr. Ray describes Thackeray as 'Horace in London', and there is truth in the comparison. Thackeray was morbidly sensitive and oppressed often with a melancholy that we do not associate with Horace; but he had learned to live with his own nature, and to accept his world. He has the urbane egotism and the common sense of Horace. Mr. Ray defends the digressions in Thackeray's later novels as the equivalent of Horatian odes and thus 'not merely acceptable but delightful'. This is an ingenious excuse for them—delightful indeed but not acceptable. However, without broaching yet the critical question, we may agree that Thackeray belongs to the line of Horace, and no doubt his adherents are drawn to him because they find him, like Horace, a master of the golden commonplace.

'A big man, a ripe man, and a complete man', Mr. Ray calls him, in defiance of the savage comments made by Professor Greig a few years ago. Thackeray's bigness was more than physical: he was generous and fair-minded (though not to Swift and the Georges). His ripeness is rather more in dispute: there were odd soft patches under the rind. As to his completeness, Mr. Ray can show that he was consistent with himself, and that he suffered no such disasters from lack of self-knowledge as befell Dickens in 1858. Certainly it is a rounded-out character that we contemplate, 'a man', in Trollope's words, 'to be loved even more than he was liked', a remarkably good parent in an age when others among his peers were not, a compassionate and charitable man. Yet was he complete as a truly great writer should be complete? Mr. Ray speaks of his 'great cultivation and wide experience', and one recalls uneasily the kinds of cultivation he totally lacked, and the many forms of experience outside his horizon.

It is on the quality of Thackeray's mind that the case for him as a great novelist must depend. 'What we honour in Thackeray', one critic has said, 'is our own mind at a finer pitch, working on our own experience widened and deepened.' Mr. Ray makes his appeal to 'readers from the relaxed, tolerant, workaday world' who 'have always thought of Thackeray as a sage and will presumably go on doing so'. Thackeray's standing, despite the pleas of the school broadly aligned with Saintsbury, is still very unsure today. Those who admire him can point to his psychological truth (Mr. Ray even compares him in the ability to trace the 'intermittances of the heart' with Stendhal and Proust) and insist on what Shaw grudgingly admitted, that Thackeray after all the 'feeble pathos' and special pleading 'gives you the facts . . . faithfully' and 'tells you no lies'. There seem to be two main arguments against Thackeray's admission to the highest rank of novelists. The first is that, once he has written *Vanity Fair*, he hardly progresses. By the end of his life the repetition had become obvious, but long before that we are getting too much of the same article. He wrote in a letter about negro slavery in the States and comparable miseries of the poor at home: 'Its true its true. God help us we are no better than our brethren—and the whole scheme of life is but maimed and partial.' And this, in different keys, and with different examples, is what Thackeray goes on saying

from bo
himself,
of suppre
by certai
be relied
not mean
the ques
for the
commen
Esmond
write can
requires
compro
matters
himself a
one book
penetrati
public p
seriousne
exempt f
Mr. Ray
too much
He achie
of the na
Victorian
as saying
Thacker
they wer
remains
stricting
became a

Letters
the ass
Illinois
Here i
and Miss
of Elizab
publishe
Browning
or is it ni
of piecem

from book to book. He has not the inventiveness, the power of returning upon himself, of facing a new challenge from changing life, which marks the novelist of supreme power and distinction. The second argument is put into our hands by certain indiscretions of his own. John Chapman is one witness (perhaps to be relied on here): 'I find that his religious views are perfectly *free*, but he does not mean to lessen his popularity by fully avowing them; he said he had debated the question with himself whether he was called upon to martyrize himself for the sake of his views and concluded in the negative.' (One would like comments on this from Tolstoy and Lawrence.) Again, after concluding that *Esmond* had been a failure, he confided in a letter: 'We must take pains and write careful books when we have made 10000 for the young ladies.' (This requires comment from Flaubert, Henry James, and Conrad.) Thackeray compromised largely: his excessive prudence as editor of the *Cornhill* in the matters of sex and politics reveals most glaringly the extent to which he saw himself as paterfamilias and public guardian. Mr. Ray concludes that there was one book Thackeray still had it in him to write, 'a book of Swiftian power and penetration. But such an effort would have been out of harmony with his public personality, and would have required from him a concentration and seriousness of purpose of which he no longer seemed capable.' Genius is not exempt from the wear and tear that exhausts other men; yet these sad words of Mr. Ray's amount to a declaration of bankruptcy. Thackeray had sacrificed too much to the ideal of the gentleman. The gain to our social life was substantial. He achieved something for which we may be grateful by his 'lifelong criticism of the narrow and distorting patterns into which evangelicalism sought to force Victorian character and manners'. Elsewhere Mr. Ray quotes Justin McCarthy as saying that if the young men of the 1850's 'talked Dickens', they 'thought Thackeray'. His ideas were, as Mr. Ray claims, diffused through society. But they were not ideas that transcended that society. Thus it seems Thackeray remains a Victorian novelist, with the faults and virtues implied by that restricting term. Though never wholly at one with the Victorian world, he became a representative man. Hence perhaps the greatest value of this biography.

HENRY GIFFORD

Letters of the Brownings to George Barrett. Edited by PAUL LANDIS with the assistance of RONALD E. FREEMAN. Pp. x+392. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1958. \$6.50.

Here in the wake of Mrs. Miller's *Elizabeth Barrett to Miss Mitford* (1954) and Miss McCarthy's *Elizabeth Barrett to Mr. Boyd* (1955) is the third collection of Elizabeth Barrett Browning's letters to a particular correspondent to be published in the present decade. The most enthusiastic students of Mrs. Browning's work, who now have to seek out her published letters in eight—or is it nine?—distinct collections, must be beginning to realize the disadvantages of piecemeal publication. Inconvenience of reference is one thing, but the risk

of injustice to Elizabeth Barrett Browning's reputation will presently be seen to be real and a more serious matter: too many trivialities are being printed, and the repetition of small talk in much the same phrases in different letters tends to make us forget that the poet—for all her sentimentality about Flush or 'Penini', for all the bees in her bonnet about Napoleon III or table-turning—could often write vivid and unaffected prose. Even by Victorian standards Mrs. Browning was, for reasons first of illness and later of foreign exile, a voluminous correspondent—at different times letters were a substitute for conversation with those both inside and outside the family circle whom she was unable to meet except at long intervals. The obvious conclusion to draw is that her letters should be selected for publication with the utmost stringency and care if we are to appreciate what may prove to be her most genuine claim on our interest, her handling of prose.

These remarks have a general application. When the University of Illinois acquired its own collection of Browning papers in 1950, it was hardly to be expected that these letters to George Barrett, the most important part of the collection, would not sooner or later be published in full. If Professor Landis had been entrusted with the task of editing an ideal selection from all Elizabeth Barrett Browning's correspondence, I am sure he would not have included in it all her fifty-eight letters to her brother George, here accompanied by thirty letters from Robert Browning to the same brother (most of them after Elizabeth's death in Florence in 1861). But, when this allowance has been made, the editor cannot be cleared so easily of the charges of a lavishness too often extravagant and an excess of scruple in editorial method. The introduction is a thorough and capable piece of work, but it is disfigured by rarely using one word where ten will do; the plates, eight in number, include photographs of Leighton's monument to Mrs. Browning in the English Cemetery at Florence and of the Rezzonico Palace in Venice where Robert Browning died, both of which would be more justifiable in a biographical study of the Brownings; the five lengthy appendices of rather marginal interest include one (Appendix 2) which contains a letter from a Dr. Coker going into the minutest details of the diagnosis and treatment in 1821 of Elizabeth's illness ('aperient medicine is required', &c.); and the commentary is sometimes absurdly elaborate. The last is a serious charge, but consider, for example, two sentences from a Torquay letter of 15 February 1841, 'Flush⁵ amuses me sometimes when I am inclined to be amused by nothing else . . . We must make him friends with Myrtle⁶ . . .', with the explicatory annotation:

⁵ Elizabeth's now famous cocker spaniel was given to her by Miss Mitford in 1840 and is thoroughly described as to appearance and temperament in the poem *To Flush, My Dog*. He accompanied his mistress when she left England in 1846 and survived into canine old-age to be buried under Casa Guidi in Florence.

⁶ Myrtle, while not so well known as Flush, is also enshrined in verse in the following lines from Elizabeth's *Epistle to a Canary*,

There is a little dog whose name is Myrtle! . . .
A worthy dog in his totality,—
Though wanting tact and ideality.

(Hitherto exclusively for references 'My little fallen into called My

Surely on Writ? The approach

Dashes periods and indicate o and abbrevi apostroph e.g., w^dnt

It does n policy of to think h

On the excesses c

the intro portance

us little th of her let

Robert B (p. 20).

Browning a correspo

letters he ments', v

the Brow in Septe

The seco days after

self-excul Browning

short pas reason to

(*Hitherto Unpublished Poems and Stories with an Inedited Autobiography*, printed exclusively for members of the Bibliophile Society, Boston, 1914). There are several references to Myrtle, none of them complimentary, in Miller: *E.B. to M.M.*; e.g., 'My little brother's dog, Myrtle (a very brown ugly Myrtle, looking as if it had fallen into the sere and yellow leaf)' (p. 12), and 'our brown and yellow terrier called Myrtle, whose noblest qualities lie in his mind' (p. 19).

Surely one should not deal with amiable gossip as if it were so nearly Holy Writ? This nervous 'thoroughness' is displayed again in the fundamentalist approach to the text. Mr. Landis says in his preface:

Dashes and dots . . . often served her [E. B. B.] better and more readily than periods and semicolons. When dots occur within the text of the letters, they do *not* indicate omissions. Nothing has been omitted. For the same reason ampersands and abbreviations have been retained, even to Elizabeth's habit of placing the apostrophe between the two parts of the word rather than over the omitted letter; e.g., *w^d'nt*, *is'nt*.

It does not seem to me that keeping faith with an author requires such a policy of non-interference. It looks less like heroic self-denial than a refusal to think hard about the possible uses of the edition which has been undertaken.

On the other hand it should be noted that in spite of the over-conscientious excesses described there will be few readers who will not learn something from the introduction and commentary. Nor does Mr. Landis exaggerate the importance of what he has edited. The fifty-eight letters by Mrs. Browning 'tell us little that we did not know, or, at least, could not know from the great number of her letters already published' (p. 21). As for 'the man who emerges' from Robert Browning's thirty letters, he is 'commonplace to the point of boredom' (p. 20). The severity of the last remark is not misplaced, but in fairness to Browning we have to remember that George Barrett, a staid lawyer, was not a correspondent likely to stimulate his brother-in-law. There are at least two letters here (nos. 39 and 62), singled out by the editor as 'moving human documents', which deserve a place in the most strictly selected edition of letters by the Brownings. The first was left behind her by Elizabeth at 50 Wimpole Street in September 1846 to explain to her family her disappearance from home. The second was written by Robert from Florence on 2 July 1861, only three days after his wife's death—a curious mixture of heart-felt grief and defensive self-exculpation with a touch of play-acting that makes us wonder whether Browning could ever allow himself to be quite natural. For these letters and for short passages in many others—most of them by Mrs. Browning—we have reason to be grateful to Mr. Landis.

KENNETH ALLOTT

Ten Studies in the Poetry of Matthew Arnold. By PAULL F. BAUM. Pp. xiv+140. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press; London: Cambridge University Press, 1958. 30s. net.

Professor Baum's short book consists of an examination of some of Arnold's poems in ten essays, which in scope and quality differ widely and range in length from seven pages on 'Myserinus', 'Stanzas from the Grande Chartreuse', and the 'two laments' ('The Scholar-Gipsy' and 'Thyrsis') to the twenty-three pages allotted to 'Tristram and Iseult' and the twenty-seven which carry the title 'Arnold's Marguerite'. The last-named essay, always something more than shrewd chatter about Harriet (although it is this, too, very pleasantly), is reprinted from *Booker Memorial Studies* (1950) and will already be familiar to many Arnoldians. The other essays are published for the first time.

'Arnold's Marguerite' and the essay on 'Tristram and Iseult', the latter a careful examination of Arnold's handling of his sources in the poem, are among the best chapters in Mr. Baum's book. The essay on 'Resignation', which begins with a commonsensical summary of the poetic argument and ends with an elaborate explication of individual lines and passages in the form of short notes, is also valuable—an undergraduate would learn something who grappled with 'Resignation' by attempting to resolve the differences between the two treatments of the poem by Baum and Bonnerot. Other studies are slighter, some decidedly inferior. The first two on the 'Shakespeare' sonnet and 'Myserinus' are cases in point. They seem to me to be full of unnecessary misconstruction—perverse, a word that Mr. Baum applies to other commentators, is hardly too strong for some of this self-imposed puzzlement—and parts of a later study of 'The Buried Life' are similarly infected. There is nothing in the short piece on 'The Scholar-Gipsy' and 'Thyrsis' to object to on this score, but it does not amount to more than a few, though fit, reflections on the shape of Arnold's chosen stanza and his use of rhymes. (On the effect of the stanza I agree with Baum against Garrod and Ridley.) Ten of the fourteen pages on 'Empedocles on Etna' are also devoted to metrical matters. Here in this essay—and elsewhere in many places in the volume—there is an odd mixture of literary comment that is acute and agreeably set down and what must be called a sort of academic doodling. It is as if some of the shorter essays were written up without a renewal of concentration from earlier marginal jottings and miscellaneous notes. A more extensive treatment of fewer topics might have produced a better book.

Like other recent critics of Arnold's poetry Mr. Baum has been glad to pick over the materials supplied by C. B. Tinker's and H. F. Lowry's *Commentary* (1940), so that at times one feels a certain impatience with him when he snipes at its alleged imperfections (some of which are real, some imaginary)—see, for example, in the essay on 'Tristram and Iseult', the complacent footnotes on pp. 36 and 51. It is largely a matter of tone. A critic cannot afford to be so prim about trifling blemishes or supposed blemishes in the work of others unless he is doubly sure that his own text is immaculate. Yet on the very first page of the essay in question we are informed inaccurately that 'Tristram and Iseult' was first published in 1849.

A few of
'Senancou
three and
simply be
recalls a h
corroborat
tolerably v
Unfortunat
moon unt
(If the poe
it was bas
their marr

This wo
I have sai
for exam
in 'Dover

Prolegom
Pp. 196
Univers

This bo
Collected
duplicatin
a statemen
cross-refer
references
useful feat
by the cor
widely am
prejudice
as it serves
its paces.

There i
summarizi
in the har
blurb abou

automatic
ship witho
weighing,
this book.

The impli
it is used
the job of

A few other slips may be noticed. 'The Buried Life' is misquoted on p. 100, 'Senancourt' for 'Senancour' and 'Pausanias' for 'Pausanias' occur respectively three and four times, and the learned footnote on 'Dover Beach' (p. 86) is simply beside the point. Mr. Baum thinks as many of us do that 'Dover Beach' recalls a honeymoon occasion at Dover in 1851, and he proceeds to find 'factual corroboration' for this opinion by showing that moon, tide, and weather agree tolerably with the data of the poem if it was written 'in or of mid-June 1851'. Unfortunately for this demonstration Arnold did not begin his delayed honeymoon until 1 September—a fact which has been available in print since 1933. (If the poem is autobiographical, the most likely date for the incident on which it was based is 8 October 1851, the first night the Arnolds spent at Dover after their marriage on 10 June 1851.)

This would be a niggling note to end on. For three or four of the essays, as I have said earlier, there is reason to be grateful; and there are good things—for example, the firm dismissal of the Sophoclean parallels to the famous passage in 'Dover Beach'—to be found in several of the others.

KENNETH ALLOTT

Prolegomena to the Study of Yeats's Poems. By GEORGE BRANDON SAUL. Pp. 196. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press; London: Oxford University Press, 1958. 40s. net.

This book lists all Yeats's poems in the order in which they are found in *Collected Poems* (1950). It supplies for each one a record of publication (largely duplicating information in the Variorum and borrowing its numerical system), a statement of what is known about date and circumstances of composition, some cross-references (of varying completeness) to related works by Yeats, and page references to the more important critical *loci*. These last, which are the most useful feature of each entry, are sometimes supplemented with helpful comments by the compiler. He is very fair to his assembled Yeatsians, and has ranged widely amongst them; but his generosity is tempered by an understandable prejudice against those of them who are not interested in Yeats's work except as it serves as an excuse for putting some high-stepping critical method through its paces.

There is a great mass of detail, which must be treated here in an unjustly summarizing manner. I should not be comfortable if I saw this book too much in the hands of inexperienced students. There is a deplorable passage in the blurb about scholars provided with the Variorum and the *Prolegomena* being

automatically equipped to proceed with fresh work in the field of Yeatsian scholarship without spending years of effort undergone by their seniors in searching out, weighing, and sifting the hundreds of items accumulated prior to the publication of this book.

The implications of this (especially of 'automatically') are horrifying. But, if it is used with humility and discretion by those who have not abdicated from the job of doing their own weighing and sifting, and who have a substantial

Yeats library within easy reach, the *Prolegomena* will prove a reliable short cut and refresher. Harassed pedagogues, especially, whose pupils demand a ready and easy way to Byzantium and Kiltartan, will find the book a great help towards ordering their expositions of the less penetrable poems. They may even begin to wish that similar guides existed for, say, Blake or Hopkins, although it is doubtful whether the *Prolegomena* is finally to be judged as quite so safe and useful a kind of book as de Vane's *Browning Handbook* or Tinker and Lowry's *Poetry of Matthew Arnold*. From both of these it differs substantially in method and conception. My own plea to Professor Saul, had he been able to design on a more generous scale, would have been for a section on the plays, and for the inclusion of some iconographical material, including maps and pictures of Sligo and Clare-Galway. An examination of Sturge Moore's cover to *The Winding Stair* is the beginner's pleasantest entry into 'Sailing to Byzantium', just as to journey from Lough Gill to rocky Gort is to have one's eyes opened to the miracle of styles self-born and born anew.

So much good work has been published on Yeats in the last two or three years that this book is already considerably out of date. This was inevitable, but it encourages the hope that a second and considerably expanded edition may soon be forthcoming.

PETER URE

The American Novel and its Tradition. By RICHARD CHASE. Pp. xiv + 266. London: Bell, 1958. 16s. net.

The Power of Blackness. Hawthorne, Poe, Melville. By HARRY LEVIN. Pp. 208. London: Faber and Faber, 1958. 25s. net.

Professor Chase and Professor Levin are both concerned with something called the tradition of the American novel, though Mr. Levin's interest is not confined to novels. And both start from a point of view which seems to have become almost a commonplace in American criticism: that whereas the English novel is essentially harmonious, balanced, 'normative', firmly based on an accepted social and moral stability, the American novel runs to contradictions, visions, and extremities. Whereas the English novel, according to Mr. Chase, 'has followed a middle way', the American novel has included a far larger area of 'romance'. Mr. Trilling and Mr. Bewley may use a somewhat different vocabulary and emphasis, but they, along with other distinguished American critics, underwrite the essentials of this interpretation.

One sees what they are getting at, yet to most English readers the emphasis must surely seem somewhat capricious. If you take as representatives of the English tradition primarily Jane Austen, George Eliot, and (a shared inheritance which can be used to strengthen the argument either way) Henry James, and emphasize on the American side Hawthorne and Melville—with Poe thrown in by Mr. Levin for good measure—then obviously there is a case for the contrast, though the stressing of the extremity as opposed to the balance of Hawthorne's vision might be questioned. But is not the whole argument based on the

most dou
and again
obvious t
one has o
ment and
practice (i
important
he calls l
elaborate

interested
novel, as
contrasts
novel.

Mr. Le

The En
houses an

Does it?
Sons and
because t
kind of e
these lear
being Am
American

If it we
was odd o
—labour
periphera
Why mus
'power of
in the wor
of incom
in its natu
that 'rever
the guidin

Mr. Le
to be calle
behind it
ingenious
adeptness
of hand.
ten pages
while it p
of most ir
fiction fro

most doubtful premisses? *Moby Dick* is, let us agree, a great novel. But so—and again the agreement is pretty general—is *Huckleberry Finn*, and it is not obvious that Melville's total achievement is greater than Mark Twain's. And yet one has only to replace Melville by Mark Twain as a central figure in the argument and the whole story looks very different. Now it is true that Mr. Chase's practice (as opposed to his theory) is to make room for Mark Twain and to do important justice to several figures who do not fit into this pattern at all. Yet he calls his book an 'essay in definition' and is preoccupied with the theory elaborated in his first chapter and permeating his book. He is

interested mainly in defining the leading characteristics of the American romance-novel, as it may be called—that freer, more daring, more brilliant fiction that contrasts with the solid moral inclusiveness and massive equability of the English novel.

Mr. Levin is less circumspect than Mr. Chase. He can say:

The English novel, from *Waverley* to *Brideshead Revisited*, revolves around great houses and conjures with the perquisites of a settled order.

Does it? *Wuthering Heights*, *Little Dorrit*, *The Way of All Flesh*, *Jude*, *Nostromo*, *Sons and Lovers*? One stresses the absurdity not to score debating points but because the starting-point of the whole argument is so *very* wrong that some kind of explanation beyond that of caprice is surely called for. Can it be that these learned and intelligent American critics, so deep in the complex fate of being American, are moved intellectually by strange necessities that the non-American reader finds impossible to grasp?

If it were merely their estimate of the development of the English novel that was odd one would not of course—for these are books about American literature—labour the point. But the point of view involved here is not, to either book, peripheral. On the contrary, in each case it informs the whole undertaking. Why must Mr. Levin see as the *dominant* strain in Hawthorne and Melville that 'power of blackness' which is admittedly an important and significant feature in the work of both writers? Why must he drag in on equal terms Poe, a writer of incomparably lower stature, save to bolster up a theory which is schematic in its nature and dubious in its relevance? Early on one comes to suspect that 'reverence for the archetype' expressed by Melville is far more insistently the guiding force of Mr. Levin's criticism.

Mr. Levin's book is in fact an extremely high-level example of what has come to be called in America 'myth-criticism'. High-level, that is, in the sense that behind it is a mind formidably stocked with allusive material and enormously ingenious in its use. Yet the very density of Mr. Levin's allusiveness, the very adeptness of his intellectual dexterity, leads to an effect perilously near to sleight of hand. He could, you feel, argue the hind leg off a donkey and produce it ten pages further on in the guise of the collar-bone of a hare. And this facility, while it peppers his book with stimulating speculation and provides a number of most intriguing insights, makes the disentanglement of myth from history, fiction from fact, peculiarly difficult. One might take as an example the passage

(on p. 71), in which he writes of the death of Judge Pyncheon in *The House of the Seven Gables*:

[Hawthorne's] evocative fancy broods over Judge Pyncheon's body, as the Judge's watch ticks off the hours of what was to have been a busy day and what will always remain a ghostly night. Dickens imitated the morbid playfulness of this set-piece in *Bleak House*; but there the painted allegory of Lincoln's Inn points to a mystery which can be handled by detective methods.

A stimulating comparison, one feels, until one has formulated two essential questions: are the scenes referred to really in any serious way comparable? and what weight are we to give the word 'imitate'? If there is any evidence that Dickens had read *The House of the Seven Gables* in 1851 Mr. Levin does not bother to produce it. Our knowledge of Dickens's reading habits does not encourage any *a priori* assumption.

Mr. Chase is not a myth-critic and he has indeed an Appendix in which he takes some well-aimed shots at the more extreme manifestations of that tendency. His book seems to me, however, scarcely less vulnerable than Mr. Levin's, though for different reasons, and if one emphasizes the vulnerability it is not because one fails to appreciate the amount of good sense and usefully assembled information it contains. It is, rather, because *The American Novel and its Tradition* has, as it seems to me, been much overpraised and seems quite likely to become a standard work, that one feels impelled to point out some rather serious weaknesses.

In the first place, for all the talk of tradition in Mr. Chase's book, no coherent tradition of the American novel emerges. Perhaps this is inevitable; all one can say is that in the circumstances the preoccupation with the concept of tradition obscures rather than illuminates the issues. Mr. Philip Rahv, an American critic who has been successful in throwing some methodological light on the whole question, has remarked, 'The craze for myth is symptomatic of a fear of history in an age of rapid and menacing change'; I think this is true and that there is a serious danger of the word tradition going the way of the word myth. It is quite extraordinary how chary Mr. Chase, along with so many of his colleagues, is of seeing the American novel as a part of American history except in the most general and abstract sense. American literary criticism is choked with concepts about American history and the American mind; amid all the abstractions history itself seems to escape.

In the second place, in the very difficult problems of critical methodology which novel-criticism still poses, it seems to me that Mr. Chase further confounds existing confusions. His use of the word 'romance', for instance, is not merely loose but positively unhelpful, for it is never quite clear whether the word is used to indicate a particular attitude to life on the part of the novelist or in a more technical sense as a contrast to the naturalistic method of presentation: 'viewing' and 'rendering' seem to be interchangeable terms in Mr. Chase's vocabulary. And it is not only among these fundamental (and perhaps inevitably ambiguous) words that he founders. He seems to go out of his way to complicate every category he uses. Even if such a term as 'novel of manners' has any valu-

able mean-
of pervers
of manner
with atten
not matte
through t

In the t
on the sic
many con
for examp

The riv
Both Mr
Mr Trillin
sourian, t
that the ri
Finn an al
analogous
the compl
only genia

This defe
Chase on
cannot un
Mr. Eliot
that from
Twain's n
anything
in his nex
Is it serio
to convey
It is true
dance of
except in
symbolic
can be wr
discusses
Twain's n
should giv

If the s
consistenc
eclecticism
retical pos
and inform
and sharp

able meaning (which one doubts) it is surely stretching its application to a point of perversity to include *The Great Gatsby* in the category. If *Gatsby* is a novel of manners, what, short of *Billy Budd*, is not? If Mr. Chase were less preoccupied with attempts at formal definition the looseness of his critical terminology would not matter nearly so much; as it is, he deliberately chooses the difficult path through the quagmire and then keeps losing his balance.

In the third place Mr. Chase, though he is clearly and sometimes triumphantly on the side of common sense and critical scrupulousness, makes, I think, too many concessions to the myth-mongers. On the virtues of *Huckleberry Finn*, for example, he is excellent, until he gets on to the question of 'symbolism':

The river is a 'symbol' all right, a symbol of nature and of God in nature. Both Mr Trilling and Mr Eliot say that in *Huck Finn* the river is 'a god' and Mr Trilling quotes from *The Dry Salvages*, a poem by Mark Twain's fellow Missourian, the lines about the river: 'I do not know much about gods; but I think that the river/Is a strong brown god.' The river throws off in the mind of Huck Finn an abundance of poetic forms and feelings. It is a poetic symbol . . . and it is analogous, as a symbol, to the whale in *Moby Dick*. Like the white whale it has the complex and contradictory qualities of nature as well as of deity, being not only genial, sustaining and nourishing but also sinister and dangerous.

This defeats me. I have carefully re-read *Huckleberry Finn* since reading Mr. Chase on it and in several directions his chapter has proved enlightening; but I cannot understand what the paragraph just quoted means. It may well be that Mr. Eliot's god-river in *The Dry Salvages* is the Mississippi (one had gathered that from the poem) but what has this to do with the Mississippi in Mark Twain's novel? In what sense in *Huckleberry Finn* is the river a god—or indeed anything but the Mississippi river? And why on earth should Mr. Chase go on in his next paragraph to talk about the 'mythic' theme of initiation in the book? Is it seriously suggested that when Huck falls in the river Mark Twain means to convey that there is some 'significance' in this beyond his falling in the river? It is true of course that 'the river throws off in the mind of Huck Finn an abundance of poetic forms and feelings'; but what this has to do with 'symbolism' except in the sense that everything in any work of the imagination may be called symbolic I cannot see. We know that there is no limit to the nonsense that can be written about almost any great book (e.g. a recent article in *Encounter* discusses the homosexual aspects of the relationship of Huck and Jim in Mark Twain's novel), but I cannot comprehend why a critic of Mr. Chase's calibre should give currency to some of the higher flights of solemn absurdity.

If the strength of Mr. Levin's book—as well as its limitations—lies in its consistency of method, the weakness of Mr. Chase's is bound up with his eclecticism. And yet one would not wish to imply that in either work the theoretical position of the author is all-important. These are both highly interesting and informative books: which is why it is necessary to criticize them seriously and sharply.

A. C. KETTLE

SHORT NOTICES

Elizabethan Literature. By HELEN MORRIS. Pp. viii+240. London: Oxford University Press, 1958. 7s. 6d. net.

This is a welcome addition to the Home University Library. Mrs. Morris has managed to pack an immense amount of information and critical comment into a small space. It is very seldom that compression has led to confusion or half-truths, or to mere lists of authors and titles. Nor is a disproportionate amount of space devoted to minor writers: Spenser and Sidney share a chapter and Shakespeare gets one to himself. In some ways this latter is the most satisfactory chapter in the book, for here some previous knowledge in the reader is assumed and summaries of plots are dispensed with. This isolation of Shakespeare has made the preceding chapter on the drama rather difficult to follow chronologically, particularly as Greene is discussed before Kyd and Marlowe, and we go straight from Marlowe to Marston. Nor would one gather from the brief paragraph on Jonson and the comedy of humours that he was the true inheritor of Marlowe's blank verse.

Some may feel that in her anxiety to reassure the newcomer, Mrs. Morris has made it all sound too easy. In her conviction that Shakespeare's 'beauties are clear and plain, and the little obscurities not worth troubling about', Harriette Wilson may have missed things which the common reader, who is too serious a person to relish comparison with a Regency light of love, will insist on knowing. It is presumably to lighten the burden of this same reader that we have expressions such as 'hotting up the cold war against Spain', 'smog', and 'tape-recorder realism'; the contemporary analogies on pp. 120-1 are very distracting—nor is it any help towards understanding Sidney's *Arcadia* to compare it to the Brontës' family serial, still less to be told that 'Plato (like Edmund Gosse's father) had objected to fiction as "lies"'. Milton's contention that 'true temperance must see and reject temptation' ought not to remind us of Pepys's excuse for reading improper French books (p. 51, at foot, where two lines of the text have been transposed). Chapman's poetry is dismissed rather cursorily, and his translation of the *Iliad* is not even mentioned (a reference to Miss Wedgwood's companion volume on *Seventeenth-Century Literature* would have sufficed); and surely North's *Plutarch* is worth a sentence. However, these are minor blemishes in an admirable guide made still more useful by excellent indexes and bibliography, to which might be added E. Rosenberg, *Leicester Patron of Letters* (1955) which supplements P. Sheavyn, *The Literary Profession in the Elizabethan Age* (1909).

JEAN ROBERTSON

A Bibliography of Dr. John Donne. By GEOFFREY KEYNES. Third Edition. Pp. xx+286. Cambridge: University Press, 1958. £5. 10s. net.

This magnificent third edition of Sir Geoffrey Keynes's *Bibliography* contains so much valuable material that every Donne scholar and collector will wish to possess a copy of it. The bibliographical prefaces have been rewritten, the lists of copies of rare issues available in public libraries have been much enlarged, and the list of books known to have belonged to Donne's library has grown from fourteen items in the first edition (1914), to sixty-one in the second (1932), and to 197 in this edition. The cathedral libraries of Durham, Gloucester, Hereford, St. David's, and Winchester have been added to the seven cathedral libraries mentioned in the second edition, and the great American libraries are now given the place of importance which they deserve as repositories of rare Donne editions. A few fresh items have been added to the bibliography proper, such as the unique copy in Trinity College Library, Cambridge, of *Three Sermons* with a title-page reset and dated 1624, as compared with the earlier-known issue of 1623.

Appendix
by Professor
Sir Geoffrey
Memorials
'Worthy' in
ages taken
and published
Barksdale
Decemb. 2
and Chara
John Donne
edition of
this *Bibliog*
borrowing
the *Bibliog*
I have n
the sermon
the *Sermon*
Sermons wi
(of which t
This new
hands bibli
of *Pseudo*
Lord Chan
sent to his
type illustr
engravings

The Hap
Volume
in English

Dr. Rost
literature 1
time seeking
adoption of
to understand
'happy gard
universe; an
creation, wh
and threw i
Dr. Rost
familiar ma
and landsc
large part i
resolutely tr
shallow and
Dr. Rostvig
forced to lo
Rostvig's fin

Appendix V contains a long list of early references to Donne with an addendum supplied by Professor Howarth. To this I can add one small item which I should have sent to Sir Geoffrey if I had discovered it before his book was published. In Clement Barksdale's *Memorials of Worthy Persons*, published in London and printed by 'I.R.', 1661, the third 'Worthy' is Sir William Cokayne, and his 'Memorial' consists entirely of a string of passages taken out of Donne's sermon preached at Cokayne's funeral on 12 December 1626, and published in the *LXXX Sermons* of 1640, pp. 816-26. At the close of the 'Memorial' Barksdale has supplied in small type the words 'Out of his Funeral Sermon by Dr. Donne, Decemb. 23 [sic] 1626.' This was the original from which John Wilford in his *Memorials and Characters* (London, 1741), derived his 'Character of Sir Will^m Cokayne, Kt. . . by John Donne', to which G. R. Potter drew attention in Volume I, p. 31, of the California edition of Donne's *Sermons*, and which is mentioned by Sir Geoffrey on p. 50, n. 3, of this *Bibliography*. Barksdale's 'Memorial' is, I believe, the earliest piece of extensive borrowing from any of Donne's sermons. (Barksdale's book is mentioned on p. 230 of the *Bibliography*, but only in connexion with Walton's *Life of Donne*.)

I have noted a few omissions and mistakes, e.g. on p. 58 G. R. Potter's edition of the sermon preached by Donne on Ps. xxxviii. 9 is wrongly described as an edition of the *Sermon of Valediction* on Eccles. xii. 1. On pp. 54-56 for the entry 32a of *XXVI Sermons* with the very rare cancel title-page, Sir Geoffrey mentions only four known copies (of which two are in private hands) and omits the copy in Carlisle Cathedral Library.

This new edition is full of delightful touches of human interest. In Sir Geoffrey's hands bibliography is an art as well as a science. For example, we learn about the copy of *Pseudo-Martyr* which Donne sent with an autograph letter to his former employer, Lord Chancellor Ellesmere, and about the copy of *LXXX Sermons* which Izaak Walton sent to his 'most deare Ante Mrs Susanna Cranmer'. There are twelve beautiful collocation-type illustrations, and we are given an extensive list of miniatures, oil paintings, and engravings of Donne. Altogether this is a book to buy and enjoy.

EVELYN M. SIMPSON

The Happy Man. Studies in the Metamorphoses of a Classical Ideal.

Volume II. 1700-1760. By MAREN-SOFIE RØSTVIG. Pp. 480 (Oslo Studies in English 7). Oslo: University Press; Oxford: Blackwell, 1958. 18s. net.

Dr. Røstvig has completed her study of the classical motif of the *beatus vir* in English literature 1600-1760. Her first volume ended with the 'innocent epicurean' of Dryden's time seeking cultivated ease in the country. She now describes the much more solemn adoption of the creed of rural blessedness by Augustan moralists and philosophers seeking to understand the laws of nature and the law of God; the *laus agricolae* and the vogue of the 'happy gardener' (Pope, Shenstone, Lyttleton) rejoicing in rational contemplation of the universe; and that growing concern with God's benevolence, and with the goodness of his creation, which introduced public virtues into the old egocentric doctrine of the *beatus vir* and threw it into decline.

Dr. Røstvig is again excellent on the intellectual background, particularly in bringing familiar material into new focus. She gives a fresh turn to the topic of Augustan poetry and landscape-gardening. Her essay on the still underrated James Thomson, who played a large part in destroying the classical ideal of the *beatus vir*, is excellent criticism. She resolutely traces the course of the river to its end; but as it widens to the sea, the water grows shallow and the fish more commonplace. When a Watts, a Collins, or an Akenside swims by, Dr. Røstvig marks him appreciatively. But the tiddlers come in shoals here, and we are forced to look at them too with almost comic concentration. There was too much in Dr. Røstvig's first book; she still lacks the discrimination of the compleat angler.

JAMES KINSLEY

Studies in the Early English Periodical. Edited by RICHMOND P. BOND, Pp. x+206. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1958; London: Oxford University Press, 1958. 40s. net.

Although Professor Bond includes in his introductory essay a brief survey of seventeenth-century journalism, this collection of essays is specifically concerned with the period 1700-60, the Golden Age of English journalism. The periodical is neatly defined by Bond as 'a series of numbered and dated issues produced under a continuing title on a definite frequency for an indefinite period', and is described as offering 'a truly comprehensive spectacle of British civilization during one of its most influential eras'. The introduction is masterly, giving in less than 20,000 words a history of the growth of the periodic press and of its background, an account of the various types of periodical, and a review of the achievements and desiderata of scholarship in this field. This essay shows a firmer grasp of the subject than anything hitherto published, and will be one of the main starting-points for future research. It is followed by six studies, each written by a research pupil of the editor's: while not all are of equal interest, all show the accuracy, thoroughness, and width of reference to be expected of such a little senate.

The most original and revealing is 'Richard Steele, Gazetteer and Bickerstaff' by R. W. Achurch, who is able to prove that the reasons usually given for the decrease of news in the *Tatler* are wrong. Steele as editor of the *Gazette* had a monopoly of official foreign news; there were, of course, no 'foreign correspondents' and practically no home news. As editor of the *Tatler* he saw to it that he got plenty of scoops, by arranging the publication days of the *Tatler* in advance of those of the *Gazette*, and using the official dispatches freely. After a time this irregular practice came to an end, presumably because someone in authority made Steele alter the publication of the *Gazette* to thrice weekly, coinciding with the *Tatler*. Achurch also makes the important point that the only channels by which other news-sheets could get up-to-date foreign news were irregular ones, i.e. by bribing the clerks who handled the government dispatches. But these are only a few of the details of his fascinating study. The other essays concern the *British Apollo*, *Free-Thinker*, *Prompter*, *Female Spectator*, and *World*, by Drs. Belcher, Joost, Sutherland, Hodges, and Winship respectively. The first gives much new information about the business side of journalism, the second works out the authorship of the *Free-Thinker*, and proves its relationship with the Burnet family and the Walpole connexion. The *Female Spectator* is studied against the background of courtesy literature; this is a good example of the periodical as guide to behaviour and practical living, just as the women's magazines are today. The last is an efficient, and what is more remarkable, a good-humoured piece of technical bibliography. The collection fully proves, in the editor's words, 'the great usefulness of the periodic press in proper historiography'.

M. J. C. HODGART

Horace Walpole's Library. By WILMARTH SHELDON LEWIS. Pp. 74 (Sandars Lectures 1957). Cambridge: University Press, 1958. 45s. net.

Thirty-odd years ago our knowledge of Walpole's library was in Mr. Lewis's phrase 'higgledy-piggledy'. The sale in 1842 had made it famous, but the catalogue was haphazard, and Walpole's own catalogue was unknown. Still less was known about the dispersal. Today we have probably a fuller knowledge of this library than of any other that has been similarly broken up. Mr. Lewis writes modestly of his own prolonged labours and generously of Professor A. T. Hazen's expertness, and has put the story into these three absorbing lectures. The first relates the formation of the collection, and the manner of its housing and arrangement at Strawberry Hill. The second discusses the use its owner made of it. The last affords the full story of the sale in 1842 (with an interesting illustration of the hut specially built for it) and of the superb detective work by which the scattered volumes have been traced and unauthentic items, in which book-plates had been inserted later, eliminated. A great number of the books have been reassembled at Farmington and many stand side

by side ac
has follow
this latter
acquiring
through lif
There wer
is narrate

Mr. Lev
attention t
his constan
and we ma
are gratefu
this lightl
says, 'boob
on the she
The pro

The Idi

manus
mann,

Cecil S
College, C
and singin
Mr. Reev
forty of w
in bowld
Reeves ha
hope that
collection
would be
is beautif
protest, i
Cecil S

They war
there is a
when fort
Although
Bouvard
means 'di
... a girl
rose as th
of 'foggy
White G
milking t
give usef
German
Irish bal

by side according to their pressmarks as they had stood at Strawberry Hill. The chase has followed strange trails, including the library formed by a bootlegger of the Bronx. If this latter story is more dramatic, the earlier lectures are even more important. Walpole was acquiring books at the age of seven, and eight years later possessed 200; and so he went on through life. Yet the final number of his books was not spectacular as great collections go. There were about 8,000. Even so they overflowed from the library of which the construction is narrated in great detail here, into two supplementary rooms.

Mr. Lewis stresses that Walpole was not a bibliophile. He bought books without much attention to editions in order to read them and he did read them all, Mr. Lewis believes, as his constant marginalia and system of notes testify. This is the topic of the second lecture, and we may hope that Mr. Lewis has by no means said his last word on it. Meanwhile we are grateful to him for the wealth of documented knowledge that is released here. He carries this lightly and with humorous insight. He knows what it is to have to shift books when he says, 'books that have stood unmoved for years acquire a presumptive right to their place on the shelves which their owner violates at his peril'.

The production of this book is superb.

D. M. Low

The Idiom of the People. English Traditional Verse. Edited from the manuscripts of Cecil J. Sharp by JAMES REEVES. Pp. xii+244. London: Heinemann, 1958. 21s. net.

Cecil Sharp's manuscripts, consisting of fifty notebooks, are in the library of Clare College, Cambridge: they include nearly 3,000 variants of songs, ballads, carols, shanties, and singing games, taken down with their music from American and English folk-singers. Mr. Reeves has transcribed for this anthology over 100 of the 800 songs and ballads, about forty of which he claims have not been printed before; the others have appeared mostly in bowdlerized texts, in the *Journal of the Folk-Song Society* and in Sharp's books. Mr. Reeves has done a great service by producing these specimens from a great mine, and let us hope that his example will encourage someone to do the same for another Cambridge collection, the Henry Bradshaw volumes of Irish broadsides in the University Library. It would be ungrateful to quarrel over the omission of the music, when there is so much that is beautiful and moving in the words, selected by a poet's eye. But I must make a mild protest, if only because I should like to hear some of these versions sung.

Cecil Sharp and his collaborators cannot be blamed for expurgating the published texts. They wanted English folk-song to be widely known and to be sung in schools. And indeed there is a sameness about half the songs in this selection: I took her by the middle so small, when forty weeks were past and gone, and if it's a boy send the bastard off to sea, and so on. Although most of the songs are overtly sexual, this is not enough for the editor, who, like Bouvard and Pécuchet, divines symbolism everywhere. Unwilling to believe that 'foggy dew' means 'damp night air', he tells us what it really means: 'The French for dew is "rosée" and ... a girl awarded a prize for virtue is called a *rosière*'. But '*rosière*' means 'winner of the rose as the best-behaved girl', as readers of Maupassant will remember; and the explication of 'foggy' is no more convincing. Much of the scholarship displayed in the notes is of the White Goddess or free-association school; it would provoke a Johnsonian comment about milking the bull, were it not that on p. 221 the editor explains what *that* means. Other notes give useful information on parallel versions, but there are omissions: e.g. No. 35 'The German Flute' is in fact 'The Banks of the Roses', which is in O Lochlainn's collection of Irish ballads, with references, and is sung by Paddy Galvin on one of his L.P.s.

M. J. C. HODGART

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

ANGLIA

Band 77, Heft 2, 1959

The Speech of 'Book' in *Piers Plowman* (R. E. Kaske), 117-44.

Fortschrittsglaube und Dichtung im Victorianischen England (G. Müller-Schwefe), 145-72.

Verweisende Zeichen in Tennessee Williams: *Camino Real* (P. G. Buchloh), 173-203.

Claudius and Fortune (B. White), 204-7.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY

Vol. xlii, No. 1, September 1959

Ruskin's Correspondence with Miss Blanche Atkinson (M. E. Spence), 194-219.

COMPARATIVE LITERATURE

Vol. xi, No. 2, Spring 1959

T. S. Eliot's *Criterion*: The Editor and his Contributors (H. Howarth), 97-110.

The Distrest Mother, Ambrose Philips' Morality Play (P. E. Parnell), 111-23.

Balzac as a Source of George Moore's *Sister Teresa* (C. S. Brown), 124-30.

'Lov'd I not honour more': The Durability of a Literary Motif (G. F. Jones), 131-43.

The Drinkers and History: Rabelais, Balzac, Joyce (T. R. Whitaker), 157-64.

ENGLISH

Vol. xii, No. 71, Summer 1959

Edwin Muir: A Return to Radical Innocence (H. Peschmann), 168-71.

Adam Bede Reconsidered (R. A. Foakes), 173-6.

Edward Thomas in Perspective (R. Lawrence), 177-83.

ENGLISH STUDIES

Vol. xi, No. 4, August 1959

Thomas Speght as a Lexicographer and Annotator of Chaucer's Works (H. G. Wright), 194-208.

Sources of John Wilkins' Philosophical Language (1668) (O. Funke), 208-14.

Wordsworth and the Simpon Pass (M. Wildi), 224-32.

W. B. Yeats and W. J. Turner, 1935-7 (H. W. Häusermann), 233-41.

'Faithful Realism': Eugene O'Neill and the Problem of Style (R. Stamm), 242-50.

English Linguistic Invasion of Switzerland (B. M. Charleston), 271-82.

The Icicle in English Dialects (E. Kolb), 283-8.

Aspects of Kingship in *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* (H. Schnyder), 289-94.

Elizabethan Convention and Psychological Realism in the Dream and Last Soliloquy of *Richard III* (R. Gerber), 295-300.

Blushful Wine and Winking Bubbles: Keats's *Nightingale* revisited (A. Bonjour), 300-3.

The Expanded Form of the Verb and Intonation (M. Schubiger), 308-13.

Vol. xl, No. 5, October 1959

Distribution and Frequency of Scandinavian and Native Synonyms in *Kyng Alisaunder* and *Arthour and Merlin* (B. Wallner), 337-52.

A ME. Rhyme-Pair: Further Studies in Scandinavian Origins (F. Behre), 353-8.

The English Verb in its Contexts (Y. Olsson), 358-67.

Place-Names of Derbyshire (E. Ekwall), 368-75.

ME. *wold*, *awold* (O.S. Arngart), 376-8.

Meaning of *foyn* and *fo* in the Towneley Plays (A. Rynell), 379-81.

A Textual Puzzle in Daniel's *Delia* (C. Schaar), 382-5.

'She should have died hereafter' (H. W. Donner), 385-9.

ESSAYS IN CRITICISM

Vol. ix, No. 3, July 1959

'The Man who was Through with the World': An Unfinished and Unpublished Story by D. H. Lawrence, introduced by J. R. Elliott, Jr., 213-21.

The Legacy of Fenimore Cooper (D. Davie), 222-38.

Libertine and *Précieux* Elements in Restoration Comedy (C. D. Cecil), 239-53.

Blake's *Jerusalem* (W. H. Stevenson), 254-64.

English in the University: I. The English School in a Democracy (F. W. Bateson), 265-86.

Visions and Revisions: The Variorum Edition of Yeats (W. J. Harvey), 287-99.

ÉTUDES ANGLAISES

XII^e Année, No. 2, avril-juin 1959

Une Hypothèse à propos de *Comus* (E. Saillens), 100-11.

Bocca
34.
A Rea
Lost (C
Rocher
Blake

XII^e An
Sir T
(R. N
Roben
de pla
La C
(J. G
J. M
Schw
Le T
Walla
Georg
Conar

HUNTING
Vol. xxi
The
sons'
Exerc
Some
tion
351-8

LITERA
Vol. v,
Thon
Bliss
Armo
7-16
The
Roma
Willi
(J. P

MICHIG
Vol. lxx
Milt

MODER
Vol. liv
The
Ghos
An
(I.-S
Saint
Sonr
'Adu
554.
'Dri
554-
Chap
291-
Auth
Lett

Boccace en Angleterre (R. Pruvost), 124-34.

A Reading of Two Episodes in *Paradise Lost* (E. L. Marilla), 135-41.

Rochester's *Farewell* (J. Auffret), 142-50.

Blake Revisited (H. Lemaitre), 151-5.

XII^e Année, No. 3, juillet-septembre 1959

Sir Thomas Malory créateur verbal (R. N. Rioux), 193-7.

Robert Greene a-t-il accusé Shakespeare de plagiat? (R. Pruvost), 198-204.

La Correspondance d'Alexander Pope (J. Golliet), 205-11.

J. M. Murry, D. H. Lawrence, et A. Schweitzer (D. Girard), 212-21.

Le Thème du Héros dans la poésie de Wallace Stevens (M. Benamou), 222-30.

George Meredith vu par Sir Arthur Conan Doyle (P. Weil-Nordon), 231-6.

HUNTINGTON LIBRARY QUARTERLY

Vol. xxii, No. 4, August 1959

The Protestant Version of Robert Parsons' *The First Booke of the Christian Exercise* (R. McNulty), 271-300.

Some Clippings from the Pre-Restoration English Newspaper (J. Frank), 351-8.

LITERA

Vol. v, 1958

Thomas Chestre: A Speculation (A. J. Bliss), 1-6.

Arnold's *Thyrsis* (iv) (J. P. Curgenvin), 7-16.

The Saracens in the ME. Charlemagne Romances (S. Tonguç), 17-24.

William Morris in Epping and Savernake (J. Padwick), 56-63.

MICHIGAN ALUMNUS

Vol. lxxv, No. 21, Summer 1959

Milton in Venice (J. Arthos), 341-9.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW

Vol. liv, No. 4, October 1959

The Charter of the Abbey of the Holy Ghost (S. Brook), 481-8.

An Approach to Tourneur's Imagery (L.-S. Ekeblad), 489-98.

Saint-Amant, Aytoun, and the Tobacco Sonnet (W. Roberts), 499-506.

'Adulterism': An Antedating (S. Atkins), 554.

'Drink to me, Celia' (A. D. F. Brown), 554-7.

Chapman's *Tragedy of Byron*, iv. ii. 291-5 (P. Ure), 557-8.

Authenticity of James Howell's Familiar Letters (V. M. Hirst), 558-61.

MODERN PHILOLOGY

Vol. lvii, No. 1, August 1959

Formulaic Composition in Gaelic Oral Literature (J. Ross), 1-12.

'Jean de Meung', Antifeminism, and 'Bourgeois Realism' (L. J. Friedman), 13-23.

Croce and Contextualist Criticism (E. Wasiolek), 44-54.

NEOPHILOLOGUS

43ste jaarg., Afl. 3, Juli 1959

Metrische schema's van het lange vers (M. I. Gerhardt), 193-207.

Laughter in OE. Literature (S. I. Tucker), 222-6.

NEUPHILOLOGISCHE MITTEILUNGEN

Vol. lx, No. 2, 1959

The Identifying *swa* (swa) Phrase in OE. (N. Peltola), 156-73.

Beowulf and the One that Got Away (P. J. Frankis), 173-5.

n-Plurals in the Nouns of *Havelok the Dane* (G. C. Britton), 175-9.

Vol. lx, No. 3, 1959

Über etymologische Wörterbücher (V. Kiparsky), 209-30.

The ME. Syntactical Type 'his own hand(s)' (T. F. Mustanoja), 267-86.

An Inedited Scrap of ME. Verse from the W. Midlands (E. G. Stanley), 287-8.

Spenserian Humor: *F.Q.* III and IV (R. O. Evans), 288-99.

Melville's *The Confidence-Man*: Source and Meaning (J. J. Gross), 299-310.

NOTES AND QUERIES

Vol. vi, N.S., No. 7, July-August 1959

Blue dye in English Paper, 1780-1830, 240-2.

Another Chaucer Pun, 243.

A Newly-Identified ME. Prose Version of the *Gospel of Nicodemus*, 243.

Piers Plowman, B-text, Prologue, ll. 78-79, 243-4.

Interpretation of Poems by Mydwynter, 244-5.

The Complaynt of Scotlande: Patrick Cockburn, Antonio de Guevara, and Antonio de Fregoso, 245-8.

Spenser's Double Audience in *The Shepheardes Calender*, 249-50.

Shakespeare's *I Henry IV* and Nashe, 250.

'Willow Song' in *Othello*, 251-2.

Bottom, Dr. Faustus, and the Ass's Head, 252-4.

The Vocabulary of Marston (xviii), 254-5.

Hall's 'Fortunio' and 'Raymundus', 255-7.

Allusions to the Gunpowder Plot in Dekker's *The Whore of Babylon*, 257.
The Heredity and Childhood of John Donne, 257-62.

Marvell's 'Treasurer', 263-4.

Dryden's Knowledge of Historians, 264-6.

Charles Cotton's 'Sister', 266-7.

Guns on the Restoration Stage, 267-72.

Last Days of Sir Samuel Garth: Footnote to a Pope Letter, 272-4.

'Chef d'œuvre': an Antedating, 274.

Dr. Watts Looks at the Language, 274-9.

Dodsley's Contribution, 279-80.

Two Errors in Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, 280-1.

J. S. Le Fanu's *The Cock and Anchor*: Notes for *O.E.D.*, 284-5.

Ouida's *Idalia*: Source of its Moldavian Scenes, 285-6.

Eliot's *The Waste Land*: 'red rock', 286-7.

'Accident-prone(ness)', 287-8.

Irving and Moore, 288-9.

Hawthorne's *The House of the Seven Gables*: A Serpent-Image, 289-90.

Vol. vi, N.S., No. 8, September 1959

England's First Poet-Critic? [*Beowulf*], 305-6.

'Doff (off)': an Antedating, 306.

A Footnote to *Twelfth Night*, 1. iii, 306-7.

Guns on the Restoration Stage, 307-11.

An Important Unpublished Wordsworth Letter, 313-16.

The Two Wordsworths, 316-18.

Wordsworth's 'Beauteous Evening', 318-19.

The Structure of Coleridge's 'Reflections on Having Left a Place of Retirement', 319-21.

The Imagery of *Kubla Khan*, 321-4.

Hartley Coleridge, Wordsworth, and Oxford, 324-8.

The use in English of 'Aufklärung', 328-31.

Morris and Froissart, 331-3.

A Source for Dictionary Quotations [Mill's *Letters*], 333-4.

Football Words in *O.E.D.*, 335.

'Brinkmanship', 335.

Vol. vi, N.S., No. 9, October 1959

The Franklin's 'Sop in Wyn', 345-7.

Northern Idiom in *Pearl*?, 347-8.

The Heredity and Childhood of John Donne, 348-53.

'Impartial', 353-4.

Two Notes on Shakespeare [*Per.*, iv. ii. 25, *Timon*, 11. i. 13], 354-5.

The Vocabulary of Marston (xix), 355-6.

'Cynthia' in *O.E.D.*, 356.

Milton's Rooms at Christ's College, 357-8.

The Date of Milton's *Ad Patrem*, 358-9.

The MS. of *Arcades*, 359-64.

Comus, 1. 37, 364.

Lycidas, ll. 130-1, 364-6.

Milton's Two-Handed Engine and Fletcher's Two-Edged Sword, 366-7.

A Milton-Warburton Parallel for *Areopagitica*, 367.

Grosseteste on the Genealogy of Sin and Death, 367-8.

Milton, Virgil, and St. Jerome [*P.L.*, iii. 168-70], 368-9.

Thomas Adams and 'Darkness Visible' [*P.L.*, 1. 62-63], 369-70.

Vida and *Samson Agonistes*, 370-2.

The Ship-Tempest Imagery in *Samson Agonistes*, 372-3.

'Timbale': an Antedating, 375.

O.E.D.: Earlier Quotations, 375.

Some New German Words from English, 375-6.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Vol. xxxviii, No. 2, April 1959

The Romantic Movement: A Bibliography for 1958 (M. K. Nurmi), 129-227.

The Diction of the Signed Poems of Cynewulf (R. E. Diamond), 228-41.

The Revenger's Tragedy: A Study in Irony (P. Liscar), 242-51.

Some Byron Comments on Pope and Boileau (W. H. Marshall), 252-3.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY LIBRARY CHRONICLE

Vol. xx, No. 3, Spring 1959

Lawrence's Portrait of Cowper (C. Ryskamp), 140-4.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION

Vol. lxxiv, No. 4, Part 1, September 1959

'A Solempne and a Greet Fraternitie' [Chaucer's *Burgesses*] (J. W. McCutchan), 313-17.

Richard Barnfield, 'Amyntas', and the Sidney Circle (H. Morris), 318-24.

New Facts and Theories about the Parnassus Plays (M. L. Reyburn), 325-35.

The Equilibrium of Opposites in *The White Devil* (B. J. Layman), 336-47.

Mrs. Mary Davys: Forerunner of Fielding (W. H. McBurney), 348-55.

Theme and Pattern in *Barnaby Rudge* (H. F. Folland), 406-17.

Sprung Rhythm (P. F. Baum), 418-25.

The 'Abstruser Themes' of Browning's *Fifine at the Fair* (C. C. Watkins), 426-37.

The 'Fatal Woman' Symbol in Tennyson (C. de L. Ryals), 438-43.

Idea and Theme in *Howards End* (F. P. W. McDowell), 453-63.

The Affinities Between J.-K. Huysmans and the 'Rosicrucian' Stories of W. B. Yeats (M. Fixler), 464-9.
Bernard Shaw's Beginnings on the London Stage (I. McKee), 470-81.

RIVISTA DI LETTERATURE MODERNE

Vol. xii, N. 1, marzo 1959

Il Gladiatore Morente in Byron e in Pascoli (N. Poli), 59-61.

SEWANEE REVIEW

Vol. lxvii, No. 4, Autumn 1959

Homage to Allen Tate (various authors), 528-631.

The Maturity of Scott Fitzgerald (A. Mizener), 658-75.

SHAKESPEARE QUARTERLY

Vol. x, No. 3, Summer 1959

Shakespeare's Psychiatry—and After (W. Overholser), 335-52.

Titus and Cressida (A. S. Knowland), 353-65.

Brutus, Virtue, and Will (G. R. Smith), 367-79.

The Date of *Measure for Measure* (J. W. Lever), 381-8.

The Trial Pattern in *King Lear* (D. C. Hockey), 389-95.

The Secret'st Man of Blood [*Macbeth*] (W. Blissett), 397-408.

The First Production of *Julius Caesar* on the German Stage (L. F. McNamee), 409-21.

Henry IV: The King as Protagonist (A. M. McNamara), 423-31.

Queries and Notes: A Second Early Newspaper Allusion to Shakespeare, The Meaning of the Cloud in *Hamlet*, 'The Patch is Kind Enough', 'A Table of Green Fields', The Rape of Tarquin, 446-53.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY

Vol. lvi, No. 3, July 1959

The Double Authorship of *Henry VIII* (R. A. Law), 471-88.

The Sequence of the Writings of Fulke Greville (G. A. Wilkes), 489-503.

Donne's *Holy Sonnets* and the Anglican Doctrine of Contrition (D. L. Peterson), 504-18.

Honor and Fame in the Works of the Duchess of Newcastle (J. Gagen), 519-38.

George Eliot's Unpublished Poetry (B. J. Paris), 539-58.

Vol. lvi, No. 4, October 1959

Middle English Carols as Processional Hymns (R. H. Robbins), 559-82.

Six Knights at Castle Joyous (A. Fowler), 583-99.

Verbal Formulae in the Plays of Philip Massinger (C. Hoy), 600-18.

Milton and an Anthropomorphic God (J. E. Parish), 619-25.

Milton and Wither (E. M. Clark), 626-46.

Matthew Arnold and his Contemporaries: A Check-list of Published and Unpublished Letters (R. L. Brooks), 647-53.

Thomas Hardy and the Historians (E. Clifford), 654-68.

THEATRE RESEARCH

Vol. i, No. 2, June 1958

Recherche théâtrale et histoire des arts plastiques (H. Knudsen), 11-13.

Corneille in England (illustrated) (P. Hartnoll), 14-16.

American Theatre and Drama in the Eighteenth Century (B. Hewitt), 21-25.

We need Theatre History Iconographies (H. Kindermann), 32-33.

Important Articles on the Theatre in the *T.L.S.*, 1902-56 (contd.) (O. E. B. Youngs), 34-44.

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO QUARTERLY

Vol. xxix, No. 1, October 1959

The Topicality of *Little Dorrit* (J. Butt), 1-10.

Scholarship and Criticism (G. Whalley), 33-45.

Swift and the Ancients-Moderns Controversy (P. Pinkus), 46-58.

VICTORIAN STUDIES

Vol. iii, No. 1, September 1959

Darwin Anniversary Issue, 3-125.

UNIVERSITY OF
GLASGOW

EDWIN MORGAN
J. A. M. RILLIE

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

[Unless otherwise stated, London is the place and 1959 the date of publication.]

- ALLOTT, M. *Novelists on the Novel*. pp. xvi+336. 30s.
- ANCRENE WISSE. Parts VI and VII, ed. G. Shepherd. pp. lxxiv+116. 12s. 6d.
- ARMSTRONG, W. A. *The Elizabethan Private Theatres*. pp. vi+18. 1958.
- ATHERTON, J. S. *The Books at the Wake. A Study of Literary Allusions in James Joyce's Finnegans Wake*. pp. 308. 30s.
- BAMBOROUGH, J. B. *Ben Jonson*. pp. 44. 2s. 6d.
- BARBER, C. L. *Shakespeare's Festive Comedy*. pp. x+266. Princeton; London. 40s.
- BARKER, H. *Marcel Proust*. pp. 384. 36s.
- BATTESTIN, M. C. *The Moral Basis of Fielding's Art. A Study of Joseph Andrews*. pp. xii+196. Middletown, Conn. \$4.50.
- BEAVER, H. (ed.). *American Critical Essays. Twentieth Century*. pp. xvi+364. 7s.
- BENNETT, J. *Poetry and Interpretation*. pp. 185-97 (Proc. Brit. Acad. XLIV). 3s. 6d.
- BEOWULF, tr. D. Wright. pp. 122 (Penguin). 2s. 6d.
- BLOOM, H. *Shelley's Mythmaking*. pp. x+280. New Haven; London. 40s.
- BOWRA, M. *The Prophetic Element*. pp. 20. 5s.
- BRETT, R. L. *Reason and Imagination. A Study of Form and Meaning in Four Poems*. pp. xii+144. 1960. 15s.
- BROWER, R. A. *Alexander Pope*. pp. xiv+368. 35s.
- BROWNE, T. *Religio Medici*, ed. V. Sanna. Parte I, pp. xcii+176; Parte II, pp. lxxx+262. Cagliari, 1958.
- CAMPBELL, J. J. (ed.). *The Advent Lyrics of the Exeter Book*. pp. xii+138. Princeton; London. 30s.
- CAMPBELL, L. B. *Divine Poetry and Drama in Sixteenth Century England*. pp. viii+268. Berkeley; London. 35s.
- CHAUCER MINORE. (Book of the Duchess, House of Fame, Parliament of Fowls, Legend of Good Women, Troilus and Criseyde), ed. A. Zanco. pp. vi+334. Naples.
- COLERIDGE, S. T. *Collected Letters*, ed. E. L. Griggs. Vol. III, pp. lii+544; Vol. IV, pp. xii+545-1000. Oxford. £5. 5s. od.
- *Writings on Shakespeare*, ed. T. Hawkes, introd. A. Harbage. [Reprint.] pp. 256. New York. \$2.50.
- COLGRAVE, B. *The Earliest Saints' Lives written in England*. pp. 35-60 (Proc. Brit. Acad. XLIV). 3s. 6d.
- COLMER, J. *Coleridge. Critic of Society*. pp. xiv+230. Oxford. 30s.
- COOPER, W. C. P. *Snow*. pp. 40. 1958. 2s. 6d.
- CURRY, W. C. *Shakespeare's Philosophical Patterns*. pp. xiv+262. Baton Rouge, Louisiana. \$5.00.
- DANKS, K. B. *Decem Rationes. A Shakespearean Monograph*. pp. 44. 21s.
- DEARING, V. A. *A Manual of Textual Analysis*. pp. xii+108. Berkeley; London. 28s.
- DOBREE, B. *English Literature in the Early Eighteenth Century*. pp. x+702. Oxford. 42s.
- DONOHUE, D. *The Third Voice. Modern British and American Verse Drama*. pp. vi+286. Princeton; London. 30s.
- DOWNER, A. S. (ed.). *King Richard III. Edmund Kean's Performance as recorded by J. H. Hackett*. pp. xxxiv+100 (facsimile).
- DUNCAN, J. E. *The Revival of Metaphysical Poetry. The History of a Style, 1800 to the Present*. pp. x+228. Minneapolis; London. 36s.
- EARLY ENGLISH MANUSCRIPTS IN FACSIMILE. Vol. IX. *The Moore Bede*. Cambridge University Library MS Kk 5.16. Preface by P. H. Blair with contribution by R. A. B. Mynors. pp. 40+11-128v. Copenhagen; London. Kr. 550.
- EARLY ENGLISH TEXT SOCIETY. *Beowulf*. Reprod. in facsimile from B.M. MS. Cotton Vitellius A. xv, with translation and notes by J. Zupitza. 2d edn., new reproduction with introd. note by N. Davis. pp. xxii+146. 140 plates. 70s.
- *The Parlement of the Thre Ages*, ed. M. Y. Offord. pp. lxxviii+100. 28s.
- ELLMANN, R. *James Joyce*. pp. xvi+842. New York; London. 63s.

ENGEL, M.
pp. xiv+
don. 25s.

FLETCHER,
FRYCKSTE
A Study
as a Nov
FUGGER.
Europe
print.]

GARNER, I.
and the
London
GOLDING,
pp. 256
GONZALES
346. C

HABICHT,
Dichtur
Munich
HADDOCK,
pp. 32.

HELSINKI,
philolog
pp. 160
\$4.00, 4

HILLHOUS
memory
Joseph
M. Ste
neapol
HOLDER-I

Imager
in Henr
Fr. 15.4

HOLLAND
dies.
Wychen
274. C

HOLLOWAY
Brit. A
HOUGH, C.
D. H.

266. N
HOUGH, I.
Dean I
pp. viii

JEFFERSON
Malone
\$2.50.

JESSOP, T.
2s. 6d.
JOHNSTON
xii+24

JONES, J.
Butler
Austin.

JOYCE, J.
Series,
Carbon

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED

127

- ENGEL, M. *The Maturity of Dickens*. pp. xiv+202. Cambridge, Mass.; London. 25s.
- FLETCHER, I. *Walter Pater*. pp. 44. 2s. 6d.
- FRYCKSTEDT, O. W. *In Quest of America: A Study of Howells' Early Development as a Novelist*. pp. 288. Cambridge, Mass.
- FUGGER. *News and Rumor in Renaissance Europe: The Fugger Newsletters*. [Reprint.] pp. 254. New York. \$1.25.
- GARNER, R. *Henry Vaughan: Experience and the Tradition*. pp. x+176. Chicago; London. 37s. 6d.
- GOLDING, W. *Lord of the Flies*. [Reprint.] pp. 256. New York. \$1.25.
- GONZALES, F. B. *Cifra Antologica*. pp. 346. Costa Rica.
- HABICHT, W. *Die Gebärde in englischen Dichtungen des Mittelalters*. pp. 168. Munich.
- HADDOCK, N. *Practice in Spoken English*. pp. 32. Cambridge. 1s. 6d.
- HELSINKI. *Mémoires de la Société Néophilologique*. Vol. XX, pp. 430; Vol. XXI, pp. 160; Vol. XXII, pp. 390. Helsinki. \$4.00, \$2.50, \$4.00 resp.
- HILLHOUSE, J. T. *Essays collected in memory of*. From Jane Austen to Joseph Conrad, ed. R. C. Rathburn and M. Steinmann, Jr. pp. xii+326. Minneapolis; London. 45s.
- HOLDER-BARELL, A. *The Development of Imagery and its Functional Significance in Henry James's Novels*. pp. 216. Bern. Fr. 15.00.
- HOLLAND, N. H. *The First Modern Comedies. The Significance of Etherege, Wycherley and Congreve*. pp. viii+274. Cambridge, Mass.; London. 45s.
- HOLLOWAY, J. *Skelton*. pp. 83-102 (Proc. Brit. Acad. XLIV). 3s. 6d.
- HOUGH, G. *The Dark Sun. A Study of D. H. Lawrence*. [Reprint.] pp. vi+266. New York. \$1.25.
- HOUGH, R. L. *The Quiet Rebel. William Dean Howells as Social Commentator*. pp. viii+138. Lincoln, Nebraska. \$4.
- JEFFERSON, T. *Autobiography*, introd. D. Malone. pp. iv+120. New York. \$2.50.
- JESSOP, T. E. *George Berkeley*. pp. 36. 2s. 6d.
- JOHNSTON, D. *In Search of Swift*. pp. xii+240. Dublin; London. 36s.
- JONES, J. *The Cradle of Erewhon. Samuel Butler in New Zealand*. pp. xii+224. Austin. \$4.
- JOYCE, J. A. *Joyce Miscellany. Second Series*, ed. M. Magalaner. pp. xvi+240. Carbondale, Ill. \$5.00.
- KROOK, D. *Three Traditions of Moral Thought*. pp. xiv+356. Cambridge. 30s.
- KRUMPELMANN, J. T. *Bayard Taylor and German Letters*. pp. 236. Hamburg. DM. 25.00.
- KYD, T. *The Spanish Tragedy*, ed. P. Edwards. pp. lxx+154 (Revels Plays). 18s.
- LEA, F. A. *The Life of John Middleton Murry*. pp. xii+378. 30s.
- LEVIN, H. *The Question of Hamlet*. pp. xiv+178. New York; London. 18s.
- LINDSAY, D. *Squyer Meldrum*, ed. J. Kinsley. pp. vi+122. 10s.
- LOOMIS, R. S. (ed.). *Arthurian Literature in the Middle Ages*. pp. xvi+574. Oxford. 63s.
- MACCAFFREY, I. G. *Paradise Lost as 'Myth'*. pp. viii+230. Cambridge, Mass.; London. 36s.
- MALONE SOCIETY. *The Fatal Marriage*, ed. S. B. Younghughes and H. Jenkins. pp. xii+120.
- Glaphorne, H. *The Lady Mother*, ed. A. Brown, checked A. Petti. pp. xx+112.
- MANUEL, F. E. *The Eighteenth Century Confronts the Gods*. pp. xvi+336. Cambridge, Mass.; London. 54s.
- MERITON, G. *A Yorkshire Dialogue (1683)*, ed. A. C. Cawley. [Yorks. Dial. Soc. Reprint.] Kendal.
- MERRITT, H. D. (ed.). *The Old English Prudentius Glosses at Boulogne-sur-Mer*. pp. xvi+158. Stanford; London. 24s.
- MIDDLE ENGLISH DICTIONARY, ed. H. Kurath and S. M. Kuhn. Parts B.5, C.1, C.2. pp. 1021-1246; ii+254. Ann Arbor; London. 24s. each.
- MILLER, E. H. *The Professional Writer in Elizabethan England*. pp. xvi+282. Cambridge, Mass.; London. 40s.
- MOORE, J. R. *Daniel Defoe. Citizen of the Modern World*. pp. xvi+410. Chicago; London. 56s. 6d.
- MUIR, K. *Shakespeare and the Tragic Pattern*. pp. 145-62 (Proc. Brit. Acad. XLIV). 3s. 6d.
- MÜLLER-SCHWEFÉ, G. (ed.). *Sprache und Literatur Englands und Amerikas. Dritter Band. Die wissenschaftliche Erschließung der Prosa*. pp. 166. Tübingen. DM. 15.00.
- NAGLER, A. M. *Shakespeare's Stage*. pp. x+118. New Haven; London. 16s.
- NICOLSON, M. H. *Mountain Gloom and Mountain Glory. The Development of the Aesthetics of the Infinite*. pp. xviii+404. Ithaca; London. 48s.

- OLMSTED, F. L. *The Slave States (Before the Civil War)*, ed. H. Wish. [Reprint.] pp. 256. New York. \$2.50.
- PRICE, A. *Riches in a Little Room*. pp. 96. 4s. 6d.
- REAY, M. H., and SKEWS, D. M. *Principles of Précis*. pp. 128. 6s.
- REID, J. C. *Francis Thompson Man and Poet*. pp. xii+232. 25s.
- RIESE, T. *Das englische Erbe in der amerikanischen Literatur*. pp. xiv+240. Bochum-Langendreer, 1958. DM. 25.00.
- ROBBINS, R. H. (ed.). *Historical Poems of the XIVth and XVth Centuries*. pp. xlviii+440. New York; London. 60s.
- ROBBINS, W. *The Ethical Idealism of Matthew Arnold*. pp. xii+260. 25s.
- ROBINSON, R. E. *William Hazlitt's Life of Napoleon Buonaparte. Its Sources and Characteristics*. pp. 108. Geneva; Paris. Sw. fr. 11.00.
- ROSE, H. J. *Outlines of Classical Literature for Students of English*. pp. xiv+304. 16s.
- ROWSE, A. L. *The Elizabethans and America*. pp. xiv+222. 25s.
- RUSKIN, J. *Diaries*, sel. and ed. J. Evans and J. H. Whitehouse. 1874-1889, pp. x+771-1210. Oxford. 70s.
- SEWALL, R. B. *The Vision of Tragedy*. pp. xii+178. New Haven; London. 32s.
- SHAKESPEARE, W. *Antony and Cleopatra*, ed. J. D. Wilson. pp. ii+142 (Cambridge Pocket Shakespeare). Cambridge. 5s.
- *The Narrative Poems*, ed. G. B. Harrison. pp. 166 (Penguin Shakespeare). 2s. 6d.
- SHARPE, R. B. *Irony in the Drama*. pp. xvi+222. Chapel Hill; London. 40s.
- SHAW, G. B. *The Black Girl in Search of God*. [Reprint.] pp. 96. New York. 95c.
- SÖDERLIND, J. *Verb Syntax in John Dryden's Prose*. Part II. pp. xvi+244. Uppsala, 1958. 25s.
- STANG, R. *The Theory of the Novel in England 1850-1870*. pp. xii+252. 32s.
- STEELE, R. *Periodical Journalism 1714-18*, ed. R. Blanchard. pp. xxviii+346. Oxford. 42s.
- SWIFT, J. *Directions to Servants and Miscellaneous Pieces 1733-1742*, ed. H. Davis. Oxford. 30s.
- TALBOT, C. H. (ed. and tr.). *The Life of Christina of Markyate*. pp. xii+194. Oxford. 35s.
- TEACHING OF ENGLISH, THE. By R. Quirk and others, ed. and introd. R. Quirk and A. H. Smith. pp. 192. 12s. 6d.
- THALE, J. *The Novels of George Eliot*. pp. xii+176. 30s.
- TILLOTSON, K. *The Tale and the Teller*. pp. 32. 3s. 6d.
- TOMPKINS, J. M. S. *The Art of Rudyard Kipling*. pp. xiv+278. 25s.
- WADSWORTH, F. W. *The Poacher from Stratford*. pp. xiv+174. Berkeley; London. 34s.
- WAHBA, M. (ed.). *Bicentenary Essays on *Rasselas**. pp. 124. Cairo.
- WASSERSTROM, W. *Heiress of all the Ages. Sex and Sentiment in the Genteel Tradition*. pp. xii+158. Minneapolis; London. 32s.
- WEINSTEIN, L. *The Metamorphoses of Don Juan*. pp. xii+224. Stanford; London. 40s.
- WILSON, F. P. *Elizabethan and Jacobean Studies Presented to*, ed. H. Davis and H. Gardner. pp. viii+356. Oxford. 42s.
- WILSON, M. *Shelley's Later Poetry*. pp. x+332. New York; London. 48s.
- WORDSWORTH, D. and W. *Home at Grasmere. Extracts from the Journal of Dorothy Wordsworth and the Poems of William Wordsworth*, ed. C. Clark. pp. 326 (Pelican). 5s.
- WRIGHT, L. B. *Middle Class Culture in Elizabethan England*. pp. xiv+774. New York; London. [Reissue.] 70s.
- WULFSTAN OF YORK. *Die 'Institutes of Polity, Civil and Ecclesiastical'*, ed. K. Jost. pp. 274. Bern. Fr. 33.80.

26.
16.
26.
in-
H.
of
94-
int-
the
ot.
er.
and
om
on-
on
re.
di-
on-
on
on.
can
and
at.
pp.
no-
of
of
pp.
in
34-
of
K.